Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-118
Wednesday
21 June 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-118 *21 June 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

First Round of START Plenary Talks Held *[TASS]* 1
'Promising' Elements in Arms Talks Highlighted *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jun]* 1
U.S. 'Putting Off' Issue of ABM Treaty Observance *[Pasko on Moscow Radio]* 1
Matlock Opens Votkinsk Complex for U.S. Inspectors *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Jun]* 2
Kondrashov Ponders European Disarmament Process *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jun]* 2

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Consultative Committee To Meet in July *[TASS]* 5
CEMA's Sychev on Economic Integration, EEC Ties *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Leaders of 6-Country Initiative Petition Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 9
Gorbachev Sends Reply Message *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 9
Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 20 Jun 10
Comments On Hashemi-Rafsanjani Visit *[TASS]* 10
Notes Resumption of Arms Talks *[TASS]* 10
Thanks Norway for Ship Rescue *[TASS]* 10
Discusses Afghan Political Settlement *[TASS]* 11
IAEA Conference Opens in Dimitrovgrad *[TASS]* 11
Balkan Ministers Hold 'Constructive Dialogue' *[IZVESTIYA 13 Jun]* 12
Positive Developments in European Climate Praised *[Drobkov in PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 12

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Crowe Continues Tour of Soviet Union 14
Visits Uzbekistan With Akhromeyev *[Moscow Radio]* 14
Visist Belorussia *[PRAVDA 18 Jun]* 14
Crowe Visit, Medics' Aid Show 'Civilized' Ties *[G. Vasilyev in PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 14

China

Moscow TV Interviews Envoy on Beijing Events *[Moscow TV]* 15
Soviet Weekly on 'Reforming Socialism' in China *[Moscow International]* 15
Poet's Influence on Chinese Literature Described *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 13 Jun]* 16

Near East & South Asia

Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Delegation Visit Moscow 17
Shevardnadze, Lukyanov Greet Guests *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 17
Gorbachev Welcomes Guests *[TASS]* 18
Gorbachev Meets Hashemi-Rafsanjani *[PRAVDA 21 June]* 18
Further on Talks *[Tehran IRNA]* 19
Shevardnadze, Velayati Discuss Ties *[TASS]* 20
Visit Expected To Boost Relations *[TASS]* 20
Kornilov on U.S. 'Tough Course' on Afghanistan *[TASS]* 21

East Europe

Hungarian Party-Opposition Talks Previewed *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 21
Further on Nagy 16 Jun Reburial Service Reported 23
'Anti-Soviet' Feelings Manifested *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 23
'Extremist Element' Criticized *[Kondrashev on TASS]* 23
'Chauvinist Notes' Struck at Funeral *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 24
Events Leading to Nagy's Death Described *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 25
Marosan Memoires on Nagy Era Published *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jun]* 27
Demonstrators Gather at USSR Budapest Embassy *[Moscow International]* 27
Polish Sejm, Senate Elections Reported 28
2d Round Takes Place 19 Jun *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 28
Poles Reject 'Extreme Wing' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Jun]* 28
Commentary on Polish Election Scene *[Runov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Jun]* 29
Polish Figures Comment *[Moscow International]* 30
Gorbachev Overflies Poland, Greets Jaruzelski *[Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU 13 Jun]* 31
French President Mitterrand Visits Poland 31
Meets With Jaruzelski 15 Jun *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 31
Mitterrand, Jaruzelski Cited *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 32
Yefimov Sees Off Departing Polish Air Force Chief *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]* 32
Jakes Speaks at Czechoslovak Plenum 14 Jun *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Jun]* 33
Milo Jakes Cited on Restructuring in CSSR *[TASS]* 33
Czechoslovak Central Committee Confers 9 Jun *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 33
Bulgaria's Zhivkov Receives USSR's Gusev 16 Jun *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 34
Yazov, Bulgaria's Dzhurov Hold 17 Jun Talks *[TASS]* 34
Biryukova Meets Bulgarian Consumer Goods Producers *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 34
USSR's Silayev, SFRY Ministers Hold Talks *[Moscow International]* 34
Serbia's Jevtic Discusses Cooperation With RSFSR *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Jun]* 35
Medvedev Receives Romanian Party Official *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 35

West Europe

Observer Comments on Gorbachev Visit to FRG *[Ponomarev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jun]* ... 35
Yakovlev Receives Outgoing FRG Ambassador *[Moscow TV]* 37
FRG's Genscher Meets With Israel's Arens *[Hamburg DPA]* 37
Further Reportage on Baklanov Activities in Paris 37
Visit Summarized *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 37
Baklanov Meets French Minister *[TASS]* 38
Magazine Discusses Gorbachev July Visit to France *[TASS]* 38
Commentary Criticizes Turkey Over MiG Pilot *[Ter-Okopov on Moscow Radio]* 39
Austrian Antitank Missile Decision 'Out of Step' *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 40
Preparations Begin for Soviet-Austrian Space Flight *[TASS]* 40
Major USSR Order From Austrian Company Reported *[Vienna DER STANDARD 16 Jun]* 40
Italian KGB Recruit Sentenced to Prison *[Rome ANSA]* 41
Primakov, Others Attend UK Embassy Reception *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 41
Swedish Ambassador Presents Credentials to Lukyanov *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 41
Soviet Commentator Views Greek Election Results *[Korolev on Athens Radio]* 41
USSR Economist Interviewed on Trade With EC *[Vienna DIE PRESSE 19 Jun]* 42
Future Scientific Cooperation With EC Viewed *[Madrid DIARIO 16, 14 Jun]* 43

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Supreme Soviet Committees, Commissions Meet 19-20 Jun 44
Hearings on New Government Open *[TASS]* 44
Elections of Deputy Chairmen on Agenda *[Moscow TV]* 44
Ryzhkov Presents Candidates 20 Jun *[TASS]* 44
Ryzhkov Interviewed on Candidacies *[Moscow TV]* 45
Biryukova Proposed Deputy Chairman *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Proposed Social Development Head *[Moscow TV]* 46

Ryzhkov Interviewed on New Government *[Moscow TV]* 46
Yeltsin Interviewed on Supreme Soviet Position *[Moscow TV]* 48
Radio, TV To Broadcast Supreme Soviet Live 26 Jun *[Moscow International]* 49
Commission Proposes Ministerial Personnel Changes *[TRUD 14 Jun]* 49
Continued Reportage on Novyy Uzen Disturbances 52
Account of Ethnic Clashes Published *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jun]* 52
Clashes Continue; Curfew Imposed *[TASS]* 53
City Party Secretary on Unrest *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 53
More Reports on Stabilizing Situation in Fergana 54
Organizational Work Detailed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jun]* 54
Fergana Prosecutor Describes Unrest *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 55
Uzbek MVD Colonel Cited *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]* 55
CPSU Central Committee Politburo Meets 19 Jun *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 56
Mironenko's Undelivered Congress Speech Published
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Jun] 57
Shcherbitskiy Interviewed on Congress's Results *[Kiev International]* 60
Sakharov, in London, Urges Caution on 'New' USSR *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION]* 61
Central Committee Member Tolubko Dies 17 Jun *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Riga Rally Produces 'Nothing Very Constructive' *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]* 61
Draft Law on Amendments to Latvian Constitution *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 21 May]* 62
Data on 1957 South Urals AES Accident Declassified *[Moscow Radio]* 71
IAEA Experts Evaluate Gorkiy Nuclear Station
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Jun] 72
Krasnoyarsk Nuclear Waste Project Attacked *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 72
Hostage-Taking Growing in Soviet Prisons *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]* 74

Economic

Free Economic Zones Discussed at News Conference *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 75

Scientific

'Cosmos-2028' Orbital Parameters Published *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 76

Military

Commentary on Air Force Captain's Defection *[(Asaturov) on Moscow International]* 76
Officers Honored for Service in Afghanistan *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]* 76

First Round of START Plenary Talks Held

LD2106100889 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Geneva June 21 TASS—The Soviet and American delegation at the resumed Geneva nuclear and space arms talks held their first plenary meeting at the Soviet permanent mission in Geneva today.

The teams are led by Ambassador Yuriy Nazarkin (USSR) and Ambassador Richard Burt (US).

'Promising' Elements in Arms Talks Highlighted

PM2106092989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent Yu. Kosinskiy: "Talks Have Resumed"]

[Text] Geneva—The Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments have resumed in Geneva after a 7-month interval.

The main aim of the talks—at which each of the delegations consists of two groups from the USSR and the United States, for strategic offensive arms and for space arms—is the conclusion of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction of the two countries' strategic nuclear forces.

The talks which have been resumed make it possible to hope that the considerable loss of time in their development was not in vain and that the U.S. side has used the long interval beneficially to prepare constructive proposals for the reduction of strategic offensive armaments. The date of the talks' resumption was chosen by mutual agreement between USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker while the latter was in Moscow in May this year.

"We have not come to Geneva empty-handed," Ambassador Yu.K. Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation for nuclear and space armaments, stated. Assessing the prospect for the talks, he draws attention to the fact that the previous 10 rounds of talks and the draft documents jointly elaborated at them serve as a good basis for the successful completion of work.

Other positive factors can also help the participants in the talks make headway on nuclear and space weapons. Since the previous round ended in Geneva in November last year success has appeared at the talks on conventional arms. The constructive new Soviet initiatives for reducing armed forces and armaments and confidence-building and the U.S. proposals will undoubtedly have positive influence on the development of dialogue on nuclear and space weapons.

Naturally, the time has not yet come for definitive conclusions. Especially as the participants in the talks must discuss complex and as yet not definitively resolved problems like the connection between the 50-percent reductions in strategic offensive arms and the observance of the ABM Treaty, the problem of long-range sea-launched and air-launched cruise missiles, the limitation of the number of heavy bombers, the procedure for limiting mobile ICBM [intercontinental ballistic missiles] launchers, and various aspects of monitoring the observance of the strategic offensive arms treaty.

There were very promising points of contact outlined at the end of the previous round on the majority of questions on the agenda for the next round of talks on nuclear and space arms which is opening in Geneva. These points of contact can become the basis for the constructive completion of work on the treaty on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms.

U.S. 'Putting Off' Issue of ABM Treaty Observance

LD2006204189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Vladimir Pasko commentary]

[Text] [Presenter] As you know, Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons have resumed in Geneva. The talks began with a meeting of delegation heads which lasted 80 minutes. U.S. Ambassador Burt, answering journalists' questions after that, hoped that a certain amount of progress could be achieved on the road to an agreement on reducing strategic offensive weapons.

USSR Ambassador Nazarkin did not exclude such a possibility. However, he added that time will be required for this.

In the words of Ambassador Burt, in an account by an AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE correspondent, only the global approach of the Bush administration to problems on limiting strategic weapons was discussed during the meeting. As follows from a statement by the President himself, which was made on the eve of the resumption of the talks, the United States intends to focus attention on the fulfillment of the monitoring issue of the agreements which are being worked out. Many Western observers consider this to be a step which will complicate the talks. And what does commentator Vladimir Pasko think about this?

[Pasko] The question of monitoring figures in a number of the most complex questions at the Geneva talks. In contrast to the Treaty on the Elimiantion of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the agreement which is now being worked out in Geneva envisages only a reduction in weapons which come under it. If in the first case it was enough to verify merely the destruction of missiles, then here it will also be necessary to track what and how much remains on each side, and this is not entirely straightforward.

The U.S. plan to verify the fulfillment of an agreement is not yet known. According to reports from Geneva, during the meeting Ambassador Burt described it only in general terms. It has not yet been presented in complete form, but I think that the very idea of working through this question should not cause objections. I recall that we favored the strictest verification in these matters, and this is understandable. There should not remain even a shadow of a doubt on either sides over the rigorous and strict fulfillment of agreements.

In my view, what puts me on my guard about the U.S. position is not the fact that the emphasis is being placed on verification, but the fact that a number of cardinal questions which to this day remain open are being avoided. In talking about this I have in mind, first and foremost, the question of tying up the agreement which is being worked out with the observance of the Antiballistic Missile Treaty [ABM] of 1972. I remember in December 1987 the Soviet Union and the United States reached agreement on this principle. However, the United States continued along the line to create a space-based antimissile system, and subsequently began to sidestep the accord. The new U.S. Administration has also not repudiated the creation of space-based weapons systems.

Although the talk is about creating such systems of a different version, in principle this does not change anything. The deployment of them in any shape or form would become a violation of the ABM Treaty and would emasculate the very idea of curbing the strategic weapons race. Precisely for this reason, during Secretary of State Baker's visit to Moscow in May, the Soviet side reiterated that implementing a reduction in strategic offensive weapons is only possible if the ABM Treaty is preserved in the form in which it was signed. However, at one of the latest briefings, a White House representative stated that Preisdent Bush is, as before, devoted to the Strategic Defense Initiative.

All of this leads me to think that in now stressing verification problems the U.S. Administration is putting off the resolution of an acute question. However, it is perfectly clear that sooner or later it will, all the same, have to be resolved.

Matlock Opens Votkinsk Complex for U.S. Inspectors
PM1506142589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "New Accomodation in Votkinsk"]

[Text] Udmurt ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]—A new accomodation complex for American inspectors monitoring compliance with the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles was opened in Votkinsk. Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, took part in the opening ceremony.

The inspectorate was set up 1 year ago and the American specialists now have new accomodations. A previous thicket Udmurt construction workers have now created a small settlement. They have constructed three 2-story buildings and an administrative block for the 30 inspectors, which have been named for U.S. Presidents Jefferson, Lincoln, Washington, and Roosevelt.

After cutting the traditional ribbon, the chief of the U.S. diplomatic mission expressed his satisfaction with the precise execution of commitments envisaged in the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

Major General V.I. Medvedev, chief of the Soviet Nuclear Risk Reduction Center, described progress in fulfilling the treaty. "At the present time," he said, "the Soviet side has already scrapped about 1,000 intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. The American side has scrapped more than 300 missiles."

At the Votkinsk plant where the U.S. inspection group works, production is being converted to nonmilitary output. The output of machine tools, washing machines, and baby carriages has increased. Meanwhile, in the shops where missiles were previously assembled, they have started manufacturing milk-bottling machines.

Kondrashov Ponders European Disarmament Process
PM2006140189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by Stanislav Kondrashov under the rubric "Political Observer's Opinion": "Forthcoming Dividends"]

[Text] When something hurts, a person talks about it... At the USSR Congress of People's Deputies almost nothing was said about our foreign policy. Because it does not "hurt." Our relations with other states are going well and are not falling apart. The international situation is stable. There is no threat of war on the horizon and there are foreign policy successes at hand. Our press siad almost offensively little about one of these successes, a recent one, because all their attention was swallowed up by the congress. I would like to make up for this omission to some extent, especially since is the success is consolidated and embodied in a relevant international treaty, our foreign policy will make an important contribution to resolving domestic political problems through the reduction of military expenditures. This should be reflected in the store shelves and in the morale of a people eager for practical results from restructuring.

It is the case of our plan to dismantle our military machine opposing NATO forces in Europe by at least one-half. Of course, not tomorrow or the day after tomorrow but over the next few years. So far no one has calculated the possible dividends. But it may be surmised that given a favorable outcome, Mars, the god of war, will "turn loose" tens of billions rubles for the god of commerce, Mercury, and the other hitherto feeble

gods of the balanced consumer market. Tens of billions in addition to the cut of R10 billion already promised for the military budget in 1990-1991.

Two recent events make it possible to make such an optimistic forecast. Both are connected with the prospects of the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe. They began not without success in March, but in May they were even more powerfully accelerated in Moscow and Brussels.

Back in March the Warsaw Pact countries submitted radical timely proposals. But on 11 May, while receiving U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker in the Kremlin, M.S. Gorbachev went further. The USSR essentially agreed with the "bloc ceilings" suggested by NATO for tanks and infantry fighting vehicles and armored personnel carriers. A limit of 20,000 tanks and 28,000 infantry fighting vehicles and armored personnel carriers was adopted. That means that the Warsaw Pact is reducing its number of tanks by 40,000 and its number of infantry fighting vehicles and armored personnel carriers by approximately 42,000. (Presumably, the Soviet share in these reductions will be at least two-thirds.) For the third main category of ground-based armaments (artillery, mortars, and multiple rocket launchers) which the two sides count in different ways, there is no coincidence of proposed "ceilings," but the Warsaw Pact has moved closer to the NATO figures here too. It has been proposed to allow each bloc 24,000 units, with the Warsaw Pact reducing its arsenal by approximately 46,000 units—far more than NATO, as in the first two categories.

Thus the modified Soviet position has entirely eliminated NATO's main concern over the offensive nature of Soviet armed might in central Europe. The last doubts, if there were any, regarding Moscow's desire to find a common ground in Vienna have been eliminated.

To all appearances, after his first visit to Moscow J. Baker left deeply impressed by the Soviet's readiness to bring the matter to an agreement and with the conviction that the United States should respond in an equal, worthwhile manner. This was also understood by President Bush, who was under strong pressure from the public and political circles both in his own country and in the West European countries which were criticizing his administration's inaction against the background of Soviet initiatives. Ignoring the masses' feelings means weakening one's political position. Whether the leaders in the West want it or whether perhaps they do not all want it, a new climate has already arisen and is operating in the world, demanding more constructive conduct on the part of the leading participants in international politics. Reluctant to give the initiative to the other side, they are joining in a unique collaboration on a positive plane on East-West and Warsaw Pact-NATO lines. Something similar has happened to President Bush who, after 4 months of deliberations and analysis, has decided to move beyond the framework of the "deterrent policy."

The proposals which were submitted at the NATO council's 29-30 May jubilee session and which have become the Western alliance's common position were his practical debut on the West European scene. And so Bush and the other NATO leaders approved "the East's adoption of the limits proposed by the West" for tanks, infantry fighting vehicles, and armored personnel carriers. For artillery pieces they have suggested ceilings of 16,500 to 24,000 depending on what is counted. The materiel which is being reduced will be destroyed. That is part of the Western position. Here the White House does not consider it necessary to conceal its satisfaction that the East will have to "destroy tens of thousands of weapons and eliminate its superiority in these important components of military might."

Differences have narrowed not only with regard to how much to reduce and destroy but also with regard to what to reduce and destroy. Thus the United States and NATO have gone halfway to meet the USSR and the Warsaw Pact by changing their former approach and agreeing that reductions should also extend to combat aircraft. They have suggested reducing the number of aircraft and helicopters by 15 percent below the present total NATO level. (To reassure the French and the British Bush has given an assurance that this reduction will not affect their nuclear-capable aircraft.) For the first time the Americans and the NATOites in general have also agreed with the principle of reducing the personnel of their armed forces, although they interpret this reduction restrictively, as applying only to the numerical strength of U.S. and Soviet troops outside national borders within the European zone from the Atlantic to the Urals. Bush suggested that the United States and the USSR should have no more than 275,000 servicemen outside their national borders, which means reducing the U.S. troops' numerical strength by 10 percent (they now number 305,000) and halving the Soviet troops (according to NATO figures they now number 600,000).

Finally, the U.S. President suggested very a brief deadline for reaching an agreement in Vienna (6 months) and for subsequently implementing all arms and personnel reductions by 1992-1993 instead of 1996-1997 as suggested by Moscow. In terms of its temporal framework the new NATO plan looks more radical, attractive, and, if you like, more effective than ours. It is true that the 6-12 months given as the deadline for elaborating a very extensive treaty extending to the armed forces of 23 states and sharply altering the picture of over 40 years of military confrontation has generated skepticism in the West. Many people have seen in this merely a propaganda excess on the part of the U.S. President who is keen to seize the initiative from the Kremlin. The Kremlin's reaction has emerged that in principle it does not object to such a rapid race to the finishing line. E.A. Shevardnadze has noted that the Soviet side will try to reach an agreement even in 6 months. But why are the hasty NATOites taking a further 3 months even from

this niggardly amount of time, promising officially to submit their proposals as early as September, at the next round of the Vienna talks?

At "first reading" the NATO proposals several other logical inconsistencies are also obvious. The Soviet minister drew attention to one of them: Why does President Bush, in setting maximum limits for troops outside national borders, forget the British, French, Belgian, and Canadian troops on FRG territory? After all, they number approximately 100,000 soldiers backing up the West German Bundeswehr, which is already three times the size of the East German Army. We could add one more question: Why do the Western proposals limit only the numerical strength of the personnel outside national borders and not the overall numerical strength of the NATO and Warsaw Pact armed forces? On this score the Warsaw Pact plan is more logical and more radical—1.35 million servicemen as the "bloc ceilings" for Europe's entire territory.

I am deliberately leaving aside the question of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, although it is around this question that disputes have now flared up. The chart we publish from TIME magazine [the article is accompanied by a reproduction of a chart apparently illustrating discrepancies between Eastern and Western statements of their respective troop and weapons numbers] gives a graphic idea of the different assessments of the numbers of soldiers and armaments and also of the proposals put on the Vienna conference table by the two military-political alliances. Incidentally, without even counting the billions of rubles which are still lacking or remain secret, we can see clearly from this table how much the rivalry to maintain the dizzying military parity with the highly developed industrial West is costing us. And that is the main justification for our military-political restructuring. Especially as a peace which will be cheaper could be far more reliable under the conditions of honest cooperation between East and West.

And as for the question of how many laurels should be given for successes in moving toward European disarmament, it is probably still better to wait for a favorable finish. Then the presentation of laurels will present no great difficulty.

Warsaw Pact Consultative Committee To Meet in July
LD2006165889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1614 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 20 Jun (TASS)—In accordance with an agreement reached, the next conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states will take place in Bucharest during the first 10 days of July 1989.

CEMA's Sychev on Economic Integration, EEC Ties
PM2006150789 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 89 p 3

["Topical interview" with Vyacheslav Vladimirovich Sychev, secretary of CEMA, by Ye. Kalyadina: "CEMA As It Is"; date and place not given—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Vyacheslav Vladimirovich Sychev, secretary of CEMA, has already talked to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 3 years ago. Although the word "restructuring" was firmly established in the journalist's lexicon, it was not voiced, I recall, during that interview with our newspaper. There was no mention of restructuring in CEMA then. That is why we talked again about future prospects with Vyacheslav Vladimirovich. Three years have elapsed since then and a great deal has changed. At least these prospects have been clearly defined and the future has become telescoped into the concrete actions of the present. The program CEMA mapped out to restructure the mechanism for cooperation and socialist economic integration acted as the telescope. So it is time to talk about restructuring.

[Kalyadina] Vyacheslav Vladimirovich, our press certainly did not celebrate CEMA's recent 40th anniversary in the traditional "congratulatory" way. A considerable number of critical comments regarding the jubilarian were heard from newspapers and journals. One sometimes even had the impression that the 40th birthday was almost a "critical" age for CEMA. However, if we are guided by official statistics, things are not too bad. For instance, I found the following information in the bulletin prepared by the CEMA Secretariat. From 1950-1987, CEMA countries national incomes increased by almost 900 percent, gross industrial and agricultural output by 1,500 percent and 180 percent respectively, and social labor productivity by more than 600 percent. Comparable EEC figures are much lower: 270, 310, 110, and 290 percent respectively. So, where does the truth lie—in figures or journalists' assessments?

[Sychev] Both are correct, although I will say with regard to journalists that their criticism sometimes seems like a mosquito bite in comparison with the acute and impartial way we criticize ourselves in the council. The whole point is that there are two issues, and we must not get them mixed up. The first issue is what has CEMA done in its 40-year existence. The aforementioned figures provide an eloquent illustration of this. Certainly, no one can deny the council's fulfillment of the tasks it was assigned when it was set up. No one can deny the contribution it made to restoring our countries' war-ravaged economies and enabling them to overcome their economic backwardness. Our cooperation has grown immeasurably over the last 40 years. This is where the second question arises.

The tasks that we should resolve have also increased against the backdrop of this growth. Conditions for cooperation have undergone substantial changes. In the 1970's and early-1980's rates of economic growth fell in most countries in the socialist community, and this immediately took its toll on the development of the integration process. However, this process itself also began to falter at that time. The point is that at that time the international socialist division of labor was proceeding according to the following over-simplified format: The Soviet Union supplied other countries with fuel and raw materials, and received manufactured goods in exchange—mainly machinery and equipment. The joint assimilation of natural resources expanded from one 5-year plan to the next. Mutual trade increased from one 5-year plan to the next. How? By involving additional goods in the exchange. But it did not prove possible to renew the product list or organize intrasectoral exchange. Moreover, the mechanism itself became a retarding factor impeding the development of socialist cooperation. This was activated by the centralized-edict levers for management. Its main tier—specific enterprises, associations, and specific people working there—abandoned integration as a result. Another important lever—producers' direct interest in effective cooperation—was also absent.

So, this lever had to be created. With this in view the last two CEMA sessions—October 1987 and July 1988—determined the basic guidelines for restructuring the mechanisms for socialist economic integration. This was no easy matter since the countries' positions were different. That is quite natural. It would be strange to count on complete unanimity among 10 countries with 10 different levels of economic development and 10 different types of internal economic mechanisms. All the CEMA members are united in the opinion that radical changes are needed. There is no disagreement on that. The fact that different countries have made varying progress in their economic reforms is another matter. This gives rise to differing approaches. I must say on the whole that the actual atmosphere within CEMA is now quite different from what it was 5 years ago. Ideas are bubbling up and disputes—totally principled, acute, frank, without a backward glance—are taking place. This hard work has made it possible to reach concerted positions.

[Kalyadina] But "concerted positions," probably, still do not mean "unanimity"?

[Sychev] That's right. If you are talking about restructuring the mechanism for CEMA activity you have to underline that fact. While decisions are made at the

council on the basis of consensus, we are also making increasingly frequent use of another principle of ours today—the principle of interested countries. This means that only those countries that are interested in a particular project or are ready for it today take part in implementing it, rather than everyone. If someone wants and is prepared to join the others tomorrow, they can. It is on this principle that seven (at present) CEMA countries agreed to introduce mutual convertibility of their national currencies for transactions between enterprises exchanging goods and services within the framework of direct ties.

[Kalyadina] Vyacheslav Vladimirovich, in how coordinated and harmonious a fashion is our cooperation now being restructured?

[Sychev] It would, of course, be quite incorrect to present the situation in the following way: People say that the CEMA session has met and decisions have been adopted and that's that. That is not the case. Coordinated positions have still not been elaborated on a certain group of questions. The quest is continuing. Another group of tasks provoke no disagreement, and they are already being implemented. In particular, the collective concept for the international socialist division of labor, which also forms the basis for our restructuring.

[Kalyadina] What is the essence of that concept?

[Sychev] The gradual (it is planned to implement the concept over the period from 1991 through 2005) transition from the former intersectoral to the new technological model for division of labor based on profound intrasectoral specialization and production sharing.

I want to particularly point out the fact that the concept provides for broad cooperation between CEMA countries in developing the nonproduction sphere and social services.

[Kalyadina] Permit me to cite the opinion voiced by Academician O.T. Bogomolov in an interview with NOVOYE VREMYA magazine, which has stuck in my mind. Whereas we can boast of success in international specialization and production sharing in the heavy and defense industries, Oleg Timofeyevich pointed out that its weakest sectors are housing construction, agriculture, and the production of goods for the population. It is certainly time to center integration on people and their pressing needs. In this way they can judge CEMA's success not only by the growing number of cooperating plants but also by what automobile they drive, what television they watch, what clothes they wear, and what food they can buy in the stores.

[Sychev] That is quite correct. Restructuring CEMA's activities also means that we approach every question now from the viewpoint of the specific contribution it makes to increasing the population's living standards.

[Kalyadina] A great deal is now being said about the new form of cooperation—direct cooperation ties between CEMA countries. It is these that will presumably play the role of the actual lever that brings the entire new mechanism for socialist integration into play. I also found the following data in the aforementioned CEMA Secretariat bulletin: More than 16,000 Soviet enterprises have hitherto established direct ties with partners from CEMA countries, and approximately 40 international associations and more than 30 joint enterprises have been set up. The figures are, to put it bluntly, impressive. What is the real return from them?

[Sychev] Unfortunately, it is less than I would like at present. The figures also indicate that only approximately one-third of the overall number of direct ties established by enterprises involve the development of true cooperation. Why so few? There are several reasons for this. First, I must refer for the umpteenth time to the imperfect mechanism of our cooperation and the uncoordinated nature of our internal economic mechanisms. Another factor retarding the development of direct ties at the requisite level is organizations' lack of elementary experience and, if you will, enterprise. I want to stress this fact.

Direct ties are not something we have just invented. They have been implemented for many years. But what have they produced? The implementation of joint "smelts," "shifts," and similar "acts of friendship," the exchange of delegations of production frontrunners, and so on. These forms alone, although they do serve a purpose, cannot suit us today. We must fill the very concept of "direct ties" with different, weighty substance, with direct economic cooperation and direct economic production sharing. I am not afraid of repeating myself. Production sharing is an economic process that requires real return and responsibility. This means that we must be economically and financially accountable for the results of our cooperation. It would thus be simpler to visit, exchange speeches, look around, and travel...

Economic and psychological barriers are also preventing initiative from developing. An enterprise director with a skeptical attitude to direct ties probably produces the following argument: If I do not obtain satisfaction from a negligent supplier in my own country, what can be done about international ties, when no mechanism has been organized and no system of sanctions for the nonfulfillment of obligations is elaborated... This does indeed provide food for thought. These are ideas that cannot be eradicated by administrative edicts or appeals in a day. You cannot force people to display initiative. Nor should they be forced. The development of direct ties is a dialectical process. It was stimulated at the first stage by ministries. That was quite warranted in order to bring partners together and suggest the basis on which it would be best to build their relations. But the further these relations develop, the more vigorously initiative will be manifest.

[Kalyadina] Vyacheslav Vladimirovich, your account of the implementation of the collective concept for the international socialist division of labor inevitably brings us back to the question of something that does not as yet exist but without which leading economists cannot see a future for the community. I am referring to the creation of a CEMA "Common Market"...

[Sychev] Yes, this question is on the agenda. It was also noted in the collective concept itself.

The formation of a united market is a gradual, phased, and lengthy process. It will be implemented on a voluntary basis as the requisite conditions, readiness, and interest are created among the countries. To achieve this national markets need to be considerably more saturated with high-quality goods and services than now, of course, and radical changes in the technical level of production are also needed...

[Kalyadina] In that case, is it perhaps too early to think about a "Common Market"? It perhaps makes sense to first ensure the requisite wealth of the internal markets?

[Sychev] There are two approaches to the problem of a unified market. You have set out the first. The second is contradictory. It says that we must set about creating a single market immediately. The truth is somewhere in the middle. We must act in parallel. First, we must do everything possible to saturate the internal markets. Second, we must at the same time carry out work geared to creating preconditions for the formation of a unified market.

Our countries are not as yet conducting this quest. The first signs of future common economic activity are appearing with the holding of wholesale markets, the development of nongroup trade and border exchanges, and the creation of free trade zones.

[Kalyadina] So, the first steps are being taken on the road toward a CEMA "Common Market." Aren't we heading toward utopia if certain countries are already resorting to customs restrictions now?

[Sychev] No, this is not utopia. I will venture to correct your question. When you say that countries are already taking such steps now, you are probably thinking: Well what will happen tomorrow? I would have said that countries are still, rather than already, employing such measures. Because we have just noted the inadequate saturation of the internal markets with goods. Moreover, it is also a question of different pricing levels in the countries. These measures fall within the jurisdiction of the countries themselves, and that is why they have not been discussed at CEMA. In my opinion, the adoption of customs restrictions is a temporary measure and the incipient work to prepare for the formation of a single market will ultimately result in these restrictions' being lifted. At any rate our countries' long-term course is geared unequivocally toward creating conditions for the unimpeded movement of goods and services across our countries' borders.

I will stress the following point again. This is a long-term course. You can see that the EEC aimed from the very outset of its activity in 1957 to create a "Common Market" (this name for it has been consolidated since then). At the same time the EEC countries are only planning to form such a market by late 1992. So they will have spent 35 years (!) on this work. On its creation CEMA had a different task, and the question of socialist economic integration was only raised for the first time in the late sixties. Consider that the range of levels of economic development among the EEC countries is smaller than ours.

[Kalyadina] A CEMA-EEC "Common Market".... That is, of course, in the realm of fantasy at present. Is the development of relations between the two associations realistic, or is it a hare-brained scheme?

[Sychev] It is realistic. It is based on the fact that a joint declaration on establishing official CEMA-EEC relations was signed last year. To enable you to imagine how difficult this step was, I will tell you that our talks lasted 3 years. Moreover, attempts to establish CEMA-EEC contacts were made in the seventies. But they came to nothing. The countries' positions were too divergent. Time has drawn us closer together. Only the first step has been taken on the difficult road to meeting each other halfway.

When signing the joint declaration, the sides agreed on their long-term intentions while reserving the specific details of their cooperation for discussion at meetings of experts. Two such meetings have already been held. We are in favor of specific, businesslike dialogue. We are in favor of experts' sitting down at the table and holding a professional discussion on what we can work on together in a mutually interesting and beneficial way.

[Kalyadina] Incidentally, a word about reciprocity. How mutually beneficial are CEMA-EEC ties?

[Sychev] We are by no means saying that this should be a one-way street. This is a process which is beneficial for both sides and for Europe as a whole. Because CEMA puts forward all-European problems that can only be resolved by common efforts on the part of all the continent's countries as possible spheres for cooperation. These include, inter alia, the ecology, the power industry, and transportation. But who, you may ask, gains from countries' joint concerns for environmental conservation and the struggle to combat cross-border transfers of pollution? What about cooperation in power generation? Specialists know full well that the larger the number of power stations connected to a single power grid, the more reliable it is. Consequently it is nothing but mutually beneficial.

But if we are talking about how far EEC countries benefit from cooperating with us, I will cite the following eloquent example. As you are well aware, the so-called Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls' [COCOM] lists are one obstacle to organizing East-West cooperation. So it is not people in our country but people in the West who are saying—and quite rightly so—that these lists are often an instrument for encouraging competition among Western countries themselves to prevent some countries' companies from entering the socialist market, while other countries' companies remain in an advantageous position.

[Kalyadina] Watching what the Western press is writing about CEMA-EEC relations, you notice a desire to counter in one way or another the community's association on a collective level with contacts with individual socialist countries. Does this not serve as a signal that "turncoats" could appear within CEMA?

[Sychev] The so-called parallel approach was adopted during the talks on establishing official relations. This meant that the processes of developing relations between CEMA and the EEC and between the EEC and individual CEMA countries should proceed in parallel. However, as we have already mentioned, our Western partners' desire to put the stress on developing contacts with individual socialist countries is indeed apparent. In my opinion, this is a throwback to the old thinking and does not accord with the interests of developing the all-European process.

Whether one country can be a member of two associations at the same time is the sovereign affair of every country.

In conclusion, I will again stress that CEMA's position toward the EEC is utterly clear. We have left nothing unsaid and we are hushing up nothing. We are in favor of equitable and mutually beneficial cooperation. We are not introducing any complex political features here. We would like our partners also to have this approach.

Leaders of 6-Country Initiative Petition Gorbachev

PM2106115589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[Six countries leaders' address to M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet]

[Text] To Mr M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet

Esteemed Mr Chairman,

Our states put forward their initiative exactly 5 years ago on 22 May 1984.

At that time the international climate was marked by mistrust and confrontation in conjunction with the buildup in the nuclear arms race.

Our group tried to express the universal desire for an ultimately nuclear weapons-free world. We urged the U.S. and Soviet leaders to resume a constructive dialogue and begin the nuclear disarmament process.

Today, 5 years later, it is clear that the international climate has improved. You and President Reagan held a series of meetings. The peaceful settlement of a number of regional conflicts has drawn nearer. One concrete treaty on disarmament has already been signed and talks are continuing on others. Dialogue has been restored. We wholeheartedly support this process.

However, a great deal still remains to be done before the threat of nuclear war disappears. In the joint declaration we are publishing today, we determined certain steps which we consider a matter of urgency. We attach a copy of this declaration and urge you not to slacken your pace in the advance to disarmament. We deem it particularly important to complete the talks on strategic arms reductions as soon as possible.

We are reassured by the events of the last few years. However, it will always be necessary to continue our efforts for nuclear disarmament until our aim of building a world completely free of nuclear weapons is achieved.

We have sent a similar message to President Bush.

[Signed] Raul Alfonsin (Argentina)

Rajiv Gandhi (India)

Ingvar Carlsson (Sweden)

Andreas Papandreou (Greece)

Carlos Salinas (Mexico)

Julius Nyerere (Tanzania)

Gorbachev Sends Reply Message

PM2106093589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

["Message from M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the Leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden on the Fifth Anniversary of the Initiative of the Six for Peace and Disarmament"]

[Text] Gentlemen,

I have studied attentively your address and declaration adopted on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of your important initiative.

It is very clear now how important—in the period of escalating tension and the absence of dialogue between the USSR and the United States—the decision of the leaders of six countries from four continents was in trying to do their utmost to prevent the situation from sliding into one in which civilization could perish.

There is undoubtedly the merit of your initiative in the fact that it has been possible lately to start bringing international relations to a normal course and to take initial steps toward a world free of nuclear weapons violence. You can continue to count on our support.

The international community must cover a considerable road to completely implement the goal you set in 1984 of a secure and prosperous world.

The priorities you outlined in your declaration are on the whole in keeping with our approach.

I can say the following on specific problems you have raised.

First, the process of nuclear disarmament that started with the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles should become irreversible. The next stage will conclude with Soviet-U.S. negotiations on reducing their strategic offensive arms by half under conditions in which the ABM Treaty is preserved. The basis exists for this, and outstanding problems, in our view, are not insurmountable if due efforts are exerted by both sides.

The destruction of tactical nuclear weapons is an important task. There is a need here for a dialogue and negotiations, which alongside measures to reduce conventional arms, would lead to the restructuring of the armed forces in the West and East so that they serve only defensive purposes.

We fully agree with you that an agreement to ban any use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances should be reached before all nuclear weapons are eliminated. The Soviet Union is prepared to participate in such an agreement jointly with other countries who possess nuclear weapons.

Second, the task of ending nuclear testing is indeed becoming ever more important now. The Soviet Union is prepared to take this decision both on a multilateral and bilateral basis. As one of possible roads to this aim we support the idea of applying the 1963 Moscow Treaty on banning nuclear tests in three media to underground nuclear tests. I also wish to confirm that we are still prepared to announce a moratorium on all nuclear tests any time on the basis of reciprocity with the United States.

Third, the question of the nonuse of nuclear warheads from arms systems that are destroyed on other weapon systems is quite legitimate. We proposed to the United States to start drafting a verifiable agreement on ending the production of fissionable material for weapons. I believe the problem of the destruction of nuclear warheads that remain when armaments are scrapped could also be discussed in the context of such an agreement.

Fourth, space should undoubtedly remain free of arms. The Soviet-U.S. dialogue in this sphere is important, but there is a need for a more vigorous use of multilateral diplomacy, first of all at the conference on disarmament. The proposals to this effect are known. I wish to confirm that the Soviet Union has not placed arms in space on a permanent basis and has no intention of being the first to do so.

Fifth, a convention on the universal ban of chemical weapons is called upon to become an important milestone on the road to reliable peace. The Soviet Union will be doing everything within its powers to see that the negotiations on this matter reach a successful conclusion within a short period of time.

Sixth, our positions also coincide on questions of arms control. We have not only supported the idea of creating a multilateral system of arms control under UN auspices but also advanced specific proposals to this effect.

In conclusion, I would like to wish you further success in your noble undertaking.
[Signed] M. Gorbachev

Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 20 Jun

Comments On Hashemi-Rafsanjani Visit

LD2006130289 Moscow TASS in English 1256 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov expressed confidence today that the visit of Iranian Parliament Speaker 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani and his talks with Mikhail Gorbachev will give a further impetus to Soviet-Iranian relations.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani, who is also acting commander-in-chief of the armed forces, arrived in Moscow earlier in the day on an official friendly visit at Gorbachev's invitation.

Commenting on the visit at a news briefing here, Gerasimov noted the successful development of Soviet-Iranian relations lately.

He said the visit will include talks, which will be conducted on the Soviet side by Gorbachev, Hashemi-Rafsanjani's news conference and the signing of Soviet-Iranian documents.

Notes Resumption of Arms Talks

LD2006133589 Moscow TASS in English 1328 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that work at Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms, which resumed in Geneva today, will be continued on the basis of earlier achieved "common ground" embodied in existing draft documents, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a news briefing here today.

The Soviet delegation will conduct discussions in a constructive spirit, preserving everything positive that has been attained in work on a treaty for halving strategic offensive arms in the context of compliance with the ABM [Anti-Ballistic Missile] Treaty, he stressed.

During the current round of the talks the sides will review earlier progress and carry on the specific work on the treaty and associated documents, Gerasimov added.

He said that it is vital to continue preparing an accord on space arms on the basis of the 1987 Washington formula regarding the ABM Treaty.

The Soviet Union believes, he explained, that ensuring abidance by this agreement is an essential prerequisite of effecting 50-percent cut in strategic nuclear weapons.

The negotiators are also to solve a number of problems concerning the limitation of sea-based long-range cruise missiles as well as heavy bombers and their armaments, and the monitoring of mobile ICBM's [intercontinental ballistic missiles].

Thanks Norway for Ship Rescue

LD2006141189 Moscow TASS in English 1359 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—"All passengers from the crippled Soviet cruise ship Maksim Gorkiy have been taken on board the Norwegian rescue vessel Senja", Vladimir Nekhoroshev, head of the USSR State Maritime Inspectorate, told journalists today.

While sailing in thick fog, the ship carrying 575 West German tourists and a 377-man crew drifted into an ice field zone. An iceberg damaged the ship's bow. It developed leaks in two of its compartments.

"The Norwegian rescue vessel Senja approached Maksim Gorkiy five hours after the accident. Its crew began to pick up pasengers from the Soviet liner and also from lifeboats and life rafts with 326 people aboard them.

"According to the Soviet captain, none of the passengers suffered either at the moment of the accident or during the operation to take passengers aboard the Norwegian rescue ship," Nekhoroshev said.

"The Maksim Gorkiy is still afloat. The inspection of the damaged parts showed that the ship may be able to sail to Barentsburg, Spitsbergen, from where, after a minor repair, it will be sent to a repair base. Soviet rescue vessels are heading toward the Maksim Gorkiy to give the necessary aid.

"The Maksim Gorkiy was on a usual cruise and was equipped with the necessary navigation equipment for sailing in high latitudes. The investigation of the causes of the accident will be launched after the ship sails into the repair base," Nekhoroshev stressed.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, said that the Soviet Union expressed deep gratitude to the Norwegian rescuers and the Government of Norway for prompt assistance and help in saving the Soviet ship.

Discusses Afghan Political Settlement

LD2006151489 Moscow TASS in English 1440 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The way out of the Afghan crisis is possible only on condition of equitable participation in the process of a political settlement and then forming political power of the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan, Gennadiy Gerasimov told journalists today.

Commenting on Benazir Bhutto's recent visit to the United States, the head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, noted that in practice there have been no radical changes in the positions of the Pakistani and U.S. Administrations vis-a-vis Afghanistan.

At the same time, it was not left unnoticed that the discussion of the Afghan problem in Washington took on a somewhat different tone. The Pakistani and U.S. leaders stated more energetically than earlier about their commitment to peaceful ways of settling it. Such statements could only be welcomed. Until now, however, they are in conflict with Washington and Islamabad's real actions, Gerasimov said. He noted that when they speak about political settlement, the United States and Pakistan imply, just as before, unconditional removal from power of the lawful Government of the Republic of Afghanistan.

This line was developed also in the recent statement by a Pakistani Foreign Ministry spokesman, which advances the idea of setting up in Kabul the so-called neutral cabinet of technocrats as a mechanism of the transfer of power from the present regime in Kabul to a "broad-based," in the Pakistani understanding, government, that is the one which would actually represent only the opposition.

In this regard, Gerasimov noted that the formula proposed by Islamabad ignores the fact that the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan is a cohesive political force which has all potentialities to run state affairs and defend itself. The Afghan leadership's readiness for compromises demonstrates a high measure of responsibility to its people, the desire to restore as soon as possible peace and tranquility on the Afghan land rather than its weakness. The groundwork for a dialogue is available. Good will and a responsible approach by all concerned sides are needed, Gerasimov stressed.

IAEA Conference Opens in Dimitrovgrad

LD1906152689 Moscow TASS in English 1517 GMT 19 Jun 89

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Milov]

[Text] Dimitrovgrad June 19 TASS—The eleventh international conference and meetings of the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Authority] technical committee, which opened here today, will discuss development of high-temperature gas-cooled reactors which are a new trend in nuclear energetics. These events are held in the Soviet Union for the first time and will work through June 23. The meeting in Dimitrovgrad is attended by delegations of scientists and specialists from the FRG, the USA, the USSR, Japan, the United Kingdom, France as well as representatives from China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Netherlands, Turkey, South Africa and other countries.

The choice of Dimitrovgrad as the venue is not accidental. The fact is that the town has a research institute of atomic reactors, one of the USSR's largest nuclear centres.

In an interview with the TASS correspondent, the institute's deputy director, Valentin Ivanov said that there was mounting interest in the world in the prospects for the development of high-temperature gas-cooled reactors. He said: "As the research and practice to-date demonstrate, the characteristics of these reactors are quite encouraging. With their improved safety and low radiation effect on environment they ensure the possibility of producing thermal energy of enormous potential. That is why the international conference and the IAEA's technical committee will get down to specific

proposals concerning designing, licensing, construction, operation and ensuring the safety of the high temperature reactors cooled by gas."

Balkan Ministers Hold 'Constructive Dialogue'
PM1906103589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent V. Volodin dispatch: "The Balkans Opting for Cooperation"]

[Text] Bucharest—Only 2 weeks had passed since the conclusion of the Bucharest conference of experts on confidence-building and security measures in the Balkan Peninsula when the Romanian capital was again the venue for a meeting on questions of industrial cooperation and technology exchange between ministers from Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Romania, Turkey, and Yugoslavia to discuss a number of questions concerning the prospects for developing economic cooperation in the region.

In contrast with the recent Bucharest meeting, which was essentially the first attempt by Balkan states to find ways to overcome military-political confrontation in the peninsula, questions of regional economic cooperation have already been discussed on several occasions at various inter-Balkan forums. Back in 1976 a meeting of experts in Athens defined more than 150 spheres for potential cooperation between Balkan states. It took years, however, for them to start being gradually implemented. The specific nature of Balkan history is such that even this sphere contained more causes of confrontation than of accord.

But times are changing. The Balkan states' realization of the need to embark on a dialogue for the sake of security brought the foreign ministers of the region's six countries to the negotiating table in Belgrade. It was there that the idea of creating a climate of confidence in the Balkans by developing multilateral cooperation, including cooperation in spheres like trade, industry, transportation, and agriculture, was put forward. The priority avenue of economic cooperation was amplified at subsequent meetings between the six Balkan states in Sofia, Ankara, and Tirana. And even the current talks between ministers in Bucharest were preceded by painstaking work by experts.

There can be no doubt that this thorough preparation for the meeting produced tangible results. It primarily enabled the participants in the talks to leave outside the discussion framework reciprocal claims on many disputed problems, including the painful question for the Balkans of the problem of ethnic minorities. Consequently, in the participants' opinion, the ministers' meeting in Bucharest was held in an atmosphere of constructive dialogue which made it possible not only to analyze the state of national economic contacts but also to discuss a broad range of promising avenues for cooperation, beginning with the expansion of trade, collaboration in agriculture and transportation, production sharing in the creation of industrial robots and flexible automated lines and in the development of biotechnology and the cultivation of monocrystals...

It was emphasized at the conference that the thaw in the political climate in Europe is having a favorable effect on the development of inter-Balkan economic cooperation. In the last 5 years, for example, commodity turnover between Romania and Bulgaria increased 12 percent. There has been substantial growth of commodity turnover between the region's capitalist and socialist countries. The annual commodity turnover between Romania and Turkey, for example, has reached $100 million. Albania has established more active economic contacts. An Albanian-Bulgarian Intergovernmental Commission for Economic, Technical, and Technological Cooperation has been set up. The "Dunerya" and "Tumash" mixed Romanian-Bulgarian and Bulgarian-Turkish companies are functioning successfully.

But the meeting demonstrated that, despite the existence of positive developments, the potential of inter-Balkan economic cooperation still remains unutilized. There is insufficient application of progressive forms of cooperation like the creation of joint enterprises engaged in reaching markets in third countries. Incomplete use is made of the opportunities to develop border trade. Admittedly there are certain difficulties in this regard—customs barriers like the ones which separate Bulgaria and Greece as members of different economic communities.

Of course, not all the proposals by the participants at the Bucharest meeting were reflected in the final documents. Perhaps it was simply impossible to agree on the entire enormous list of economic problems during just 2 days of talks. It cannot be ruled out, however, that the questions still remaining unanswered will be included on the agenda of the next inter-Balkan meeting in Athens. The Balkan states have the desire to discuss them, to seek ways to continue their dialogue. This was demonstrated in practice by the meeting of ministers which ended in Bucharest.

Positive Developments in European Climate Praised
PM2006114989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[Vladislav Drobkov "Viewpoint": "Changing Climate"]

[Text] Several days have now passed since the completion of M.S. Gorbachev's official visit to the FRG, but politicians, journalists, academics, and business people in various countries are still discussing its results. This is perfectly natural, because it is obvious that the visit and the documents signed during it will be a long-term factor in world politics and promise to have a substantial impact on the entire course of development of events in the European region and elsewhere in the world.

The majority of observers share the opinion that firm structures and components capable of withstanding considerable stress have now been incorporated in the foundations of the common European home. This gives one hope that there will be greater harmony and understanding in the process of building a new Europe of peace and cooperation, that schedules will dovetail, and that the blueprints of the different national "teams," if you can put it like that, will be coordinated. Considering the economic might, moral authority, and political influence of our two states, their cooperation along these lines promises to bring considerable positive results. Especially as this cooperation is now based on a fundamentally new level of relations appropriate to the international role of the USSR and the FRG and the new political thinking.

It is highly noteworthy that the results of the Soviet-West German talks are indeed very significant and impressive but far from the only evidence of positive changes in Europe. This region has recently witnessed a whole series of improvements, great and small, which attest to an unquestionably warmer climate in Europe and to the fact that the barriers of superarmament and mistrust left over from the past are being swept away.

Soviet and U.S. nuclear missiles to be destroyed under the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles are still being removed from Europe according to schedule. Soviet servicemen are returning home and military hardware is being removed from the Warsaw Pact countries, thereby translating into practice our country's decision to make unilateral cuts in its arms and armed forces. The size of other socialist countries' armies is being reduced, their arsenals curtailed, and their military budgets cut. As the most recent session of the NATO Council in Brussels and subsequent sessions of the bloc's military bodies have shown, even the West is displaying a willingness not to reject the socialist countries' peace-loving initiatives out of hand and to offer its own proposals on reducing armed forces—often perfectly acceptable for discussion—in response to ours. At the Vienna talks, diplomats are urgently seeking ways to lower the level of military confrontation in Europe to reasonable sufficiency for the purposes of defense.

What is more, the changes in the general climate of relations in Europe are not restricted to the military-political sphere. Increasingly constructive efforts are also being made to build really broad economic relations free of discrimination and artificial restrictions.

In this respect the results of last week's session of the EEC Council of Ministers in Luxembourg are drawing attention. The foreign ministers adopted a decision to instruct the Commission of European Communities, which is the executive body of the "Common Market," to start talks with the Soviet Union on concluding an agreement on trade and economic cooperation. The mandate for these talks has been drafted. In addition to traditional forms of trade and cooperation, it envisages the development of ties and contacts in the field of scientific research, the development of advanced technology, nuclear safety, environmental protection, and banking, as well as improvement in enterprise management systems. The Commission of European Communities is also venturing to speak out in favor of abolishing a series of discriminatory restrictions still in effect on community countries importing Soviet goods. It seems to me that the "Common Market" and its executive body could play an even more active role in removing the artificial barriers still preventing Soviet purchases of advanced technology and top quality industrial goods in the West.

In my view, the strengthening of trust between the Europeans and their willingness to be really good neighbors are also shown by the recent decision of the European Council parliamentary assembly—the council is a consultative political organization of which 23 West European states are members—to grant the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia the status of "special invitees." This will allow representatives of socialist countries to take part in European Council work for the first time. And the council itself will reinforce its right to be called European. The work of the Paris conference on the human dimension of the all-European process is continuing in a constructive spirit. The momentum of the conference must be taken up by Copenhagen and Moscow after Paris.

So, the European people's desire for peace and good neighborliness is being increasingly fully reflected in real action. Although there are still a considerable number of unresolved problems and substantial obstacles in the way of erecting a common European home, the international climate in Europe is more and more obviously changing, and changing for the better.

United States & Canada

Crowe Continues Tour of Soviet Union

Visits Uzbekistan With Akhromeyev

LD1906213689 Moscow Domestic Servie in Russian 1400 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] Admiral Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces, who is touring the USSR, today became acquainted with life in Uzbekistan. He is accompanied by Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev. The guest saw the sights in Tashkent, visited the Turkestan military district museum, and made an excursion to Samarkand.

Visist Belorussia

PM2006131589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Visit to Minsk"]

[Text] Minsk, 17 Jun—Admiral William Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, who is making a trip around the country, arrived in Minsk from Leningrad today. He is accompanied on his trip by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and first deputy defense minister.

Admiral Crowe was met at the airport by Colonel General A.I. Kostenko, commander of the Belorussian Military District, and other officials. The guest laid flowers at the foot of the burial mound of eternal glory erected in honor of the four fronts of Soviet troops that liberated Belorussia from Hitler's invaders in the summer of 1944.

On the same day he visited the district training center, where he was present during a battalion tactical exercise and was shown examples of the Ground Forces' combat hardware and armaments.

In the afternoon the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff visited the Belorussian State Museum for the History of the Great Patriotic War. He viewed the exhibition along with Soviet veterans of the meeting on the Elbe and wrote in the Honored Visitors' Book. Admiral Crowe was accompanied by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, who had arrived in Minsk.

Crowe Visit, Medics' Aid Show 'Civilized' Ties

PM2006085589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 89 Second Edition p 7

[Gennadiy Vasilyev "Viewpoint": "The First Shoots of Civilized Relations"]

[Text] Admiral W. Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, has paid an official visit to our country. The Pentagon's top military man (the U.S. Defense Department is traditionally headed by a civilian) came to Moscow at the invitation of the USSR Armed Forces' leadership. At virtually the same time a group of army doctors specializing in the treatment of burns flew into the Soviet Union from San Antonio (Texas). They were headed for the Ufa region, where the disaster hit us.

These two reports appeared in the stream of news at virtually the same time. Despite being on different levels, they are linked by the fact that they affect cooperation between our two countries. And by the fact that, as the U.S. admiral said at Moscow Airport, they demonstrate a "general warming of the international atmosphere and the further development of U.S.-Soviet relations." Yes, that is true. But if you think about it, there is something more than that in these coinciding facts. Each in its own way indicates a very important phenomenon of our time—the incipient process whereby two great powers are surmounting numerous obstacles and gradually moving toward rational and civilized relations. Relations based not on ideological opposition, confrontation, and the threat of force but on a real account of interests—one's own and other people's.

Adm Crowe seems to have brought to Moscow an understanding broadening among Western politicians and military men of the specific features of our times and primarily the main reality of our age: that nuclear war cannot be won and can only be prevented. On the very first day he and Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and first deputy defense minister, signed an agreement between the USSR and U.S. governments on the prevention of dangerous military activity.

I recall that this is not the first Soviet-U.S. accord of this kind. The Soviet-U.S. agreement on the creation of nuclear risk reduction centers signed almost 2 years ago in Washington is working successfully. In accordance with the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, a group of observers is at work carrying out on-site monitoring of the fulfillment of this important agreement. It is now the practice that observers from the opposing side attend maneuvers conducted by NATO and Warsaw Pact forces. The sides are voluntarily beginning to disclose some of their "military secrets" on the premise that in our day adequate information on each other's armed forces helps to consolidate general security, stabilize the situation, and strengthen confidence.

As for the U.S. physicians who rushed to help in Bashkiria, here we are dealing with another phenomenon of the same order—the increasing understanding that wherever people live their fates are interconnected—and with the heightening sense that someone else's pain is also your own.

I am talking about the formation of civilized relations because at the basis of both the former and the latter lies a realization which is becoming increasingly clear: namely that despite our fundamental differences—political, economic, and ideological—we belong to a single

human race. The grave problems which confront us all on the eve of the third millennium can be successfully resolved only by all states and peoples together.

The process of forming the new political thinking is difficult. In its path lie the debris of concepts and habits formed over decades, of cold war and confrontation. It is being vigorously obstructed by those who make a "living" out of the arms race and the incitement of hostility among peoples. But just like the snowdrops emerging from under the crust of the thawing ice, so the shoots of reasonable, rational relations between countries belonging to different social systems and different military alliances are forcing their way into the world. They are fragile shoots. But the future belongs to them because they bear life within them.

China

Moscow TV Interviews Envoy on Beijing Events

LD2006162389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Video interview with USSR Ambassador to PRC Oleg Aleksandrovich Troyanovskiy by Moscow TV's Beijing correspondent Vladimir Kulikov; date not specified; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Kulikov] How do you assess the situation in China—in Beijing—at the present time?

[Troyanovskiy] Unpleasant events have occurred, public order has been violated, a military clampdown has been imposed, and there have been people killed and injured, but I would say that the general opinion now is that the situation is normalizing. And of course, it is our wish that the Chinese people—our great neighbor—that they turn this page in their history as quickly as possible and proceed further along the path of building socialism and modernizing the country, and along the path toward developing friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

[Kulikov] What was the position and the work of the Soviet Embassy during these—let's be frank—difficult days?

[Trolyanovskiy] There was no day when the work of the embassy was disturbed. I would say that none of our comrades found themselves in a dangerous situation; this applies to embassy employees, to our journalists here and to our students and other students on special degree courses. We have quite a lot of people scattered about the country, and we received no SOS signals from anyone of them. Therefore, if in the Union, any relative is worried about their dear ones, I can tell them there are no grounds for this.

[Kulikov] What is the Chinese public's attitude to the statement of the People's Deputies Congress which became known?

[Troyanovskiy] It was received in a positive way in Chinese official circles, and I would say, by the public too, because the main point of this statement is our principled position of noninterference in the internal affairs of any other country—in this case China. It has not been that long since this visit [by Gorbachev] which was, I would say, of immense significance, and the Chinese themselves see this visit as an historic visit, and Comrade Gorbachev said at the Congress that this was an event of worldwide significance. [Video shows two men talking in a courtyard of a building]

Soviet Weekly on 'Reforming Socialism' in China

OW2006122689 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Announcer-read observer's commentary from NOVOYE VREMYA: "Good Wishes Toward the Chinese People "]

[Text] Dear listeners, NOVOYE VREMYA, a Soviet weekly journal, has just published an observer's commentary entitled "Good Wishes Toward the Chinese People." We are inviting you to hear the commentary.

Not long ago, we rejoiced over the good results of Comrade Gorbachev's visit to China and the achievements in normalizing Soviet-Chinese relations. What made us most happy was the warm hospitality accorded the Soviet leader by both the Chinese leaders and people, including China's young people. At that time, the Chinese youths were holding peaceful demonstrations in support of domestic democratization. But nearly 2 weeks later, the news from Beijing told us a completely different story, a tragic story.

In renovating socialism, China has become an example for others to follow. The change in China's domestic situation is not entirely unexpected. Some people are stunned, however, and have asked: How could such a thing have happened in China, a nation that has embarked on the road of reform and modernization with full confidence? Well, let us try to analyze the causes of the incidents which have taken place.

China's achievements are really impressive. In a short time, its grain output has increased by 100 million tons, and the annual rate of the increase of production of meat is 120 percent. Over the past 10 years, its industrial output has grown at an annual rate of over 11 percent. Some 18,000 Sino-foreign joint ventures have been established in China. China has also attracted some $60 billion of foreign capital from abroad. However, even under these circumstances, one still must realize that the Tiananmen Square incident was not accidental. In China, complicated economic and social problems have piled up. Because of the dominance of small handicraft industries, planting in the rural areas, the unfair procurement prices paid for farm produce, as well as a number of other problems, China's grain output has ceased to grow in recent years, and the production of meats and

cotton have often been interrupted. Industrial production is extremely strained. China's enterprises are plagued with shortages of raw materials and electric power. Communications and transportation are overburdened. There is a marked polarization between the rich and poor. Annual inflation has reached 30 percent. The urban residents' actual income has dropped by nearly half. Corruption and bribery among government officials and robbery, theft, and murder at the other end of the social strata are also on the rise. Because of these occurrences, a feeling of discontent is rising in China. The poor people in the countryside are envious of their more fortunate neighbors. The poor workers are very angry with those peddlers who have become rich selling imported daily commodities. Government workers are suffering from endless transfers and reorganizations. Party workers cherish the memory of the time when they enjoyed unlimited power. Activists of the cultural revolution period still believe in the dogma of total equalitarianism, and dream about a political comeback. The policy of promoting large-scale cooperation with foreign countries does not appeal to everyone. At the same time, one also hears this advice: China should go the way of the West because socialism and the Communist Party have failed.

Does all this mean that Beijing's policies are all wrong? No, not by any means. China's economic reform is necessary. Only by reform can socialism become sound and strong. In straightening out the ideology concerning the methods and forms of socialist management and in practice and the theory of practice, China is far ahead of us. The only difference between China and us is that China is relatively slow in the democratization of political life. However, we cannot say that China has done nothing in this regard. As stressed by Beijing beforehand, political reform must be gradual, careful, rational, and steady; and stability is more important than democracy. Because of their low education level, the Chinese people are still incapable of direct elections beyond the level of local government leaders. At the same time, it is very clear that China still lacks political (?flexibility). This prompted the college students to stage their spring demonstrations which were immediately joined by people from all walks of life.

What attitude do we take toward the Tiananmen Square incident? As everyone knows for many years in the past, we attempted to teach other nations and their people how to manage their affairs. Now we realize that even we ourselves are far from being successful in handling our own affairs. To put it simply, we are unqualified to be teachers to others. However, what is more important is that even if we have made brilliant achievements, no one has ever given us the right to teach others either in the past or at present. This kind of attempt violates the elementary requirements of international law. As a passing reference, the Soviet Union has more than once paid dearly for forgetting these elementary requirements including the price paid for forgetting to abide by these requirements in its relations with China.

Another reasons for our refraining from criticizing what the soldiers did in Tiananmen Square is because many facts about the tragedy in Beijing, which took place so far away from us, are still unclear. In China, no doubt, there are people who oppose socialism, who want to plunge China once again into the abyss of the cultural revolution, and criminals. However, I think what is more proper right now is to hope that the Chinese people will expeditiously overcome their domestic trouble and again advance on the road of reform.

Poet's Influence on Chinese Literature Described

18001214 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 13 Jun 89 p 7

[Reprint of Gao Maka article carried in RENMIN RIBAO, translated by F. Tavrovskiy: "Anna Akhmatova and the Literature of China"]

[Text]This was the headline in one of the May editions of the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO on the eve of the centenary of the eminent poetess Anna Akhmatova above an article by Gao Maka, as published below.

The holiday of "Daunwu" (the fifth day of the fifth month on the lunar calendar—translator's note) is approaching, a day honoring the memory of the great poet Qu Yuan, and I recalled the well-known Soviet poetess Anna Akhmatova, who translated "Lisao" ("The Sorrow of the Exile") into Russian. For soon after the holiday of "Daunwu" we will mark the centennial of her birth.

Akhmatova was born 28 years before the October revolution and lived 49 years of her life in the Soviet epoch. The poetess had to endure many adversities, and only in the final years of her life were things more calm for her.

The name of Anna Akhmatova was first heard in our country in a negative context. In 1927 a book entitled "Russian Literature" was published in the Shanghai "Chuangzao" ("Creativity") Literary Society in which Akhmatova was criticized: "Certain poetesses have have been harping on just one thing: God, God, God! But earthly matters do end with a heavenly ruler and lost valuables will not return." Now Anna Akhmatova is extensively known, but then she was included among a number of other poetesses. When he returned from Moscow the author of the book "Russian Literature" familiarized himself with Soviet revolutionary literature. It is clear that the extreme leftist course pursued at that time in Soviet Literature had to influence our revolutionary writers.

The book "The Literature of a Great Decade" by Professor P.S. Kogan, translated into Chinese and reprinted many times, had an extraordinary following in progressive literary circles. Kogan was far removed from the

rapture of Akhmatova's poetry, and he wrote that the main thing in them was a direct perception of the world and the prayer for solemn silence, and the religious sentiments.

In 1929 Li Iman translated two of Akhmatova's poems. The translations were edited by Guo Moruo. The translator and the editor assessed the creativity of the poetess as follows: "In her work one senses elusive lyrical inflections, and though the verse is simple her language is characterized by a thoughtful and unusual use of simple words. The October Revolution did not frighten Akhmatova and as before she is living in the Soviet Republic." An objective and fair assessment. Akhmatova endured severe trials in her life but she never thought of leaving her motherland. Akhmatova wanted to share her destiny with her own people, all their joys and sorrows; there was more sorrow than joy.

In 1946 the All-Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) Central Committee decree "On the Journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD" was published. A translation of the decree was published in virtually all the liberated regions of China. The spirit of the decree influenced the views of many Chinese figures in literature and the arts. Accordingly, for a long time the name of Akhhmatova was seen in China through the prism of this party document. The decree was rescinded last year.

After the "cultural revolution" I had an opportunity to read Akhmatova in the original. There were two thick volumes and I experienced some astonishment at how much those books tugged at the heart. They contain a candid and ultimate expression of the tragic destiny of the Soviet people. I recognized that as a woman, while seeing all the cruelty of the world about her, Akhmatova preserved her own character and convictions, and the essential nature of the epoch was mercilessly shown in her verse.

When I found that Akhmatova often used to translate our ancient poetry I experienced an even greater feeling of respect for her. The first Russian translation of "Lisao" ("The Sorrow of the Exile") came from her pen; Akhmatova worked on the literal translation done by N.T. Fedorenko.

N.T. Fedorenko is a well-known Soviet sinologist whom I met quite recently in Beijing. And I know that he put his heart and soul into the translation of the "Lisao" ("The Sorrow of the Exile"). I asked him to share his recollections of this. Fedorenko said that in the early fifties a book of the poems of Qu Yuan was being prepared for publication in the USSR. Fedorenko painstakingly, line by line, translated the "Lisao" into Russian and then visited Akhmatova and expressed the hope that she would do some literary work on the translation. At first the poetess was reluctant to assume such a great responsibility but then Fedorenko convinced her and Akhmatova decided to give it a try. However, she had to study a great amount of reference material. Fedorenko brought her the materials, one after another, but this was no enough for Akhmatova.

And at that moment Akhmatova's only son was unjustly arrested and it is difficult to imagine how in such circumstances the poetess was able to complete the translation. Fedorenko said to me: "She re-read every line, every word of my text, and then she really started the work. Only Akhmatova had such magical skill, and the result of her labor was the well-known translation of the 'Lisao.' It is perhaps just as good as the original."

In addition to Qu Yuan, Akhmatova also translated Li Bo and Li Shanying. But translation was not at all the main activity of the poetess. Her main achievement was her own creativity. Deprived of the opportunity to write verse herself, Akhmatova moved to translation.

Even when Akhmatova was alive she said in REKVIYEME that if one fine day they raised a monument to her then she hoped that it would stand not on her motherland on the seashore, not in Tsarskoye Selo where she spent her younger years, but at the entrance to the Leningrad prison. She stood there for 300 hours waiting for news of her unjustly condemned son. I do not know whether or not the Soviet people are about to raise a monument to Akhmatova, but in our Middle Kingdom her good name has already been restored and Chinese readers have raised a mighty monument to her in their hearts!

Near East & South Asia

Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Delegation Visit Moscow

Shevardnadze, Lukyanov Greet Guests

PM2106105589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Visit"]

[Text] 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, chairman of the Islamic Consultative Assembly and acting supreme commander in chief of the Iranian Armed Forces, arrived in Moscow 20 June on an official visit at the invitation of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

He was met at Vnukovo Airport by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; A.I. Lukyanov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and other officials.

The welcoming party included V.V. Gudev, USSR ambassador to Iran, and N. Heirani-Nobari, Iranian ambassador to the USSR.

An honor guard of Moscow Garrison troops formed on the airfield. The band played the two countries' national anthems. A.I. Lukyanov and 'A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani reviewed the Soviet troop formation. The solemn welcome ceremony ended with a march-past by the honor guard.

The motorcade with motorcycle escort went from the airport to the city.

Gorbachev Welcomes Guests

LD2006123889 Moscow TASS in English 1230 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Islamic Consultative Assembly and acting commander-in-chief of the Armed Forces of Iran, was greeted with a formal Kremlin welcome after arriving in Moscow today on an official visit at the invitation of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

The ceremony took place in the Grand Kremlin Palace where the motorcade carrying the guest and escorted by motorcycle outriders arrived from the airport.

With an official from the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Protocol Department showing the way, the Iranian leader walked up the main staircase, which was lined up by guards of honour, to St. George's Hall.

There he was officially welcomed by Mikhail Gorbachev.

Both leaders then went to St. Catherine's Hall for talks.

Gorbachev Meets Hashemi-Rafsanjani

PM2106110389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 June 1989 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[PRAVDA item under heading: "Official Visit"]

[Text] Talks were held after the solemn welcome ceremony between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Islamic Consultative Assembly and acting commander-in-chief of the Armed Forces of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people Gorbachev welcomed the lofty guest. In your person, he said, we are receiving a representative of the state which is our old neighbor and which embarked on the path of revolutionary renewal. Building relations with Iran is no problem for us. Though they did not always go well in the past, we were always convinced of the need for broad cooperation and good neighborliness.

We heard that your visit is the realization of the will of the late imam. For us this is an indisputable confirmation of the seriousness of your intentions. We respond with a friendly and sincere striving to build relations on a new foundation. I am convinced that this is in the interests of both countries. Judging by the message which I received from Ruhollah Musavi Khomeyni, the Iranian leadership holds the same view.

Gorbachev once again offered condolences to the Iranian people on the death of the leader and the founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani expressed gratitude for this sympathy on the death of the imam and alluded to his message which opened up new horizons for cooperation with the USSR. He expressed the conviction that the policy of restructuring and new thinking is of immense significance not only for the Soviet Union itself, but also for the development of Soviet-Iranian relations and is conducive to the positive processes in the region and the international arena.

'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani made a short review of a number of key problems on which the stands of the Soviet and Iranian leadership are close or even identical. These include ensuring univeral security and disarmament; foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean; the unconditional right of every people and state to the freedom to independently decide its destiny; viewing Afghanistan as an independent, nonaligned, neutral country which is friendly to all its neighbors; the Iranian-Iraqi negotiating process on the basis of UN Security Council Resolution 598; the need to strictly respect international standards and regulations; and numerous problems of bilateral relations connected with economy, culture, ecology, and other spheres of cooperation.

Gorbachev agreed with this analysis and with the statement that never before have our two neighboring states had such chances for expanding their cooperation.

The sides agreed that during the visit members of the delegation would examine with advisers and experts concrete proposals that would later be discussed and recorded in corresponding agreements.

During the visit, Gorbachev said, we sill sign documents on principles of relations and on cooperation for a period ending in 2000. They are important not only because of their unusual content, but also because of the fact that in the eyes of the two nations, of the whole world, we are two large neighboring states with serious and far-reaching plans. This is why I regard your visit as a landmark event.

Now that our relations are acquiring some dynamics, when the mechanism of consultations and the search for joint solutions is emerging, it should be particularly emphasised that we favor a political dialogue, regular contacts, and mutual links both at the high political level and at the level of respective government agencies and other organizations engaged in concrete tasks.

We are ready to go as far as Iran; we are ready to meet halfway, Gorbachev concluded. In so doing, let the Iranian revolution preserve its values, its goals just as our restructuring is inspired by its values and its ideas. In the hardest times of our relations we held a well-considered position, the more so, there cannot be and will not be anything in our policy now which would damage Iran's interests.

[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian in a similar report broadcast at 1800 GMT on 20 June adds: "Taking part were: Shevardnadze; Katushev; Bessmertnykh; Chernyayev; Konarev, USSR Minister of railways; Grishin and Mordvinov, USSR deputy ministers of foreign economic relations; Omelichev, first deputy chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR; Alekseyev, head of a department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and Gudev, USSR ambassador to Iran.

"On the Iranian side were: Velayati, foreign minister Reza'i, commander of the Islamic Revolution Guards Corps; Iravani, minister of economy and finance; Nabavi, minister of heavy industries; Ruhani, chairman of the parliamentary commission on defense; Musavi-Lari, member of the presidium of the parliament; Va'ezi and Lavasani, deputy foreign ministers; (Felasiyan) adviser to the acting supreme commander in chief of the armed forces; and Heyrani-Nobari, Iran's ambassador to the USSR."]

Then a talk was held with a lesser number of participants, in the presence of only foreign ministers. The sides discussed some issues of world politics, the situation in the region, including prospects for overcoming the Middle Eastern conflict, and reaching an Afghan settlement. The talk also concerned the USSR and Iran's attitude to some "third countries" and some matters of bilateral cooperation.

The talks will be continued.

Further on Talks

LD2006222989 Tehran IRNA in English 2120 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, June 20, IRNA—Iran's Majlis Speaker Hojjat ol-Eslam Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev held their first round of talks at the Kremlin Tuesday evening.

The meeting took place shortly after the arrival here of a high-ranking Iranian delegation headed by Rafsanjani who is the guest of the Soviet leader.

The visit also takes place about two weeks after the demise of Iran's revolutionary leader Imam Khomeyni who passed away following a heart attack in Tehran on June 3. Days before his departure, the founder of the Islamic Republic advised Iranian authorities to improve ties with their northern neighbor.

The Iranian delegation here includes Foreign Ministers 'Ali Akbar Velayati, Heavy Industries Minister Behzad Nabavi, Commander of the Islamic Revolution's Guards Corps (IRGC) Mohsen Reza'i, as well as a number of Majlis deputies and senior officials from seven ministries.

Hojjat ol-Eslam Hashemi-Rafsanjani, also armed forces acting commander-in-chief and most probably the future president of the Islamic Republic of Iran, is the most senior Iranian official to visit the Soviet Union since the 1979 Islamic revolution.

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and First Vice-President Anatoliy Lukyanov greeted the Iranian delegation at the airport. Speaker Rafsanjani also received an official welcome at the Grand Kremlin Palace which normally hosts heads of state or government.

The Kremlin welcome indicates the significance the Soviets attach to Rafsanjani's long delayed visit.

The speaker had been invited by his Soviet counterparts to visit Moscow two years ago but at that time Iran did not take the issue seriously for a number of reasons, including the Soviet military support for Iraq in its war against Iran and the Soviet military occupation of Afghanistan.

But with the Iraq-Iran war coming to an end after Tehran's acceptance of U.N. Security Council Resolution 598 in August and the Soviet troop pull-out from Afghanistan in February last year, the ground for improved ties between the two countries was paved. Gorbachev's commendable reforms in the Soviet society also contributed to the Tehran-Moscow rapprochement.

Speaking in the meeting with Rafsanjani, Gorbachev expressed the condolences and sympathies of the Soviet nation and government on the passing away of Imam Khomeyni who in a rare message last year urged Gorbachev to study Islam as an alternative to communism.

There are over 50 million Muslims living in the Soviet Union and Rafsanjani in an interview before leaving Tehran expressed hopes his visit would leave its positive impact on the condition of Soviet Muslims.

"We are seeking ways to s rengthen ties and friendship with the Islamic Republic of Iran," Gorbachev told Rafsanjani in the meeting, "and Your Excellency's visit is a good development in mutual relations."

"We think we can further bilateral cooperation on the basis of respect for each other's interests and good neighborliness. We explicitly declare that our country supports your anti-imperialist revolution."

In response, Speaker Rafsanjani thanked Gorbachev for his welcome and conveyed to him the greetings of Iran's new leader Ayatollah 'Ali Khamene'i.

"After we got acquainted with your ideas we thought we can have good relations with you. Our assessment of the developments in the Soviet Union under your leadership is positive."

On the developments in the Islamic Republic, the armed forces acting commander-in-chief said, "the important development in our country after the revolution is that the people and the authorities decide for themselves without (allowing) the intervention of any foreign elements."

"In the past and before Your Excellency's coming to power, there were some points of concern for your neighbors...but your way of thinking has created peace among your neighbors so much so that they can deal with you more conviniently..."

The speaker said obstacles, such as the Iraq-Iran war and the Soviet military presence in Afghanistan, had been removed from the way of expanding mutual ties. Furthermore, he said, the new developments in the Soviet Union which led to an exchange of messages between the leaders of the two countries, have opened a new chapter in bilateral relations.

"We take the present situation seriously and realistically and believe that your invitation too indicates that you also want to be serious," Rafsanjani told Gorbachev.

The two sides also discussed the Afghan issue, the U.N. Resolution 598 calling for an immediate end to Iraq-Iran hostilities, and ways to further strengthen relations in various areas.

The two countries are to sign a number of important agreements in diversified fields in conclusion of the speaker's visit.

Shevardnadze, Velayati Discuss Ties

LD2106114989 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met Iranian Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati today.

During their meeting, the ministers examined in a principled way questions concerning the further development of Soviet-Iranian relations. They pointed out that these relations which entered a new stage after Mikhail Gorbachev and Imam Ruhollah Musavi Khomeyni exchanged messages, have acquired new features showing that the two countries are improving goodneighbourly relations, strengthening mutual trust and developing all-round cooperation which conforms to the interests of the Soviet and Iranian peoples.

The sides noted that the level of cooperation reached in Soviet-Iranian relations enables the two nations to boost this cooperation and to lend it a long-term and stable character in all directions and to fully use advantages offered by the geographic position of the two countries.

The ministers analysed the progress on fulfilling the protocol on consultations between the foreign ministries of the two countries, signed early in 1989, and drew the conclusion that this protocol gave a chance to put such mutual contacts on a sound and regular basis and imparted them greater dynamism conforming to the requirements of Soviet-Iranian relations as a whole.

The sides discussed several issues concerning both current world developments and the situation in the Middle East and the adjacent areas. In this context they pointed to the importance of U.N. Security Council resolution 598 for a settlement between Iran and Iraq. When discussing the situation in Afghanistan, the two ministers noted that it is necessary to stop urgently the bloodshed in that country and to give the Afghan people a chance to decide their destiny so that a long-coveted peace and quietude would come to the Afghan land.

Visit Expected To Boost Relations

LD2006135489 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Islamic Consultative Assembly and acting commander-in-chief of the Armed Forces of Iran, arrived in Moscow today on an official visit at the invitation of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Soviet-Iran relations have seen both ups and downs but on the whole have been and remain traditionally friendly. They have grown especially strong lately.

In the end of last February the Islamic Republic of Iran was visited by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

During his meetingss with Iranian President Seyyed 'Ali Khamene'i and with Hashemi-Rafsanjani he said that the Soviet leadership, which has made deideologising state-to-state relations one of the basic principles of its policy, attaches priority to developing goodneighbourly relations with Iran, despite essential ideological differences between the two countries.

A similar attitude, according to Khamene'i, is taken by Iran whose attitude to other countries is determined not by their ideology, but by their policies. It was stated that the Soviet Union and Iran can maintain constructive interaction on a wide range of international issues where they share the same fundamental objectives—peace and the settlement of tensions. Deputy Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Hoseyn Lavasani was in the Soviet capital in the middle of last March for consultations and

at the end of that month Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati came to Moscow on a brief working visit and was received by Gorbachev.

Significantly, the Soviet Union is the first country to host Rafsanjani on an official visit following the death of Iranian leader Imam Ruhollah Musavi Khomeyni whose name is associated with the recent headway in Soviet-Iranian relations.

In the Soviet Union there is confidence that the visit by Rafsanjani will give a fresh impulse to the continued progress of Soviet-Iranian relations along the path of goodneighbourliness and cooperation and will help improve mutual understanding and strengthen cooperation between the two countries.

Kornilov on U.S. 'Tough Course' on Afghanistan

LD2006163689 Moscow TASS in English 1558 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov:

Disquieting reports come off teleprinters. The idea of "removing" the lawful Afghan government is still rehashed in Islamabad and Washington. There is a report of Kabul news agency BAKHTAR about the intention of the armed opposition to use chemical means of warfare. The British newspaper INDEPENDENT reports today about a sharp increase (in) the supplies of U.S. armaments to rebels.

All these reports are circulated at a time when, it would seem, the course of events shows convincingly that the banking on power methods with regard to Afghanistan is futile. The lawful government of the Republic of Afghanistan and its armed forces showed the resolve and readiness to uphold the country's independence on their own, without participation of Soviet troops. Kabul's policy of reconciliation wins ever more supporters. Then what is the explanation for the fact that even in this situation definite circles in Islamabad and those who back them persist with attempts at diktat with regard to a sovereign state?

There is apparently only one explanation, that Pakistan's and the United States' "Afghan policy" is being shaped by those who are against settlement, who bank not on objective realities but on regional ambitions and self-seeking political calculations. This is also confirmed by the results of the recent Pakistani-U.S. negotiations in Washington. Their participants expressed the intention to continue their "tough course" against Afghanistan. And while some Western media, for instance, the French "LE MONDE," are amazed by such an unconstructive approach, others point out not without reason that having assumed such a stand Islamabad has immediately been "rewarded" by Washington's consent to supply 60 up-to-date F-16 fighter-bombers to Pakistan.

The negative aspects of this political line are so apparent now that those who shape this line have to try to justify themselves. Seeking to explain why the U.S. Department of State and the National Security Council oppose changes in the policy with regard to Afghanistan, THE WASHINGTON POST, for instance, writes that continuity is regarded as a virtue by American dipomats. Well, continuity in policy can really be welcomed if it means the continuation and development of positive processes, and not the repetition of the previous errors and unjustified "power methods". Indeed, dosen't the encouragement of the attempts to implant in Kabul a "government" formed outside Afghanistan without taking into consideration the will and opinion of the Afghan people mean the violation of the Geneva Accords, one of whose guarantors Washington should be?

The calls for a war till victory are dangerous and pointless. The only possible road to a just solution to the Afghan problem is not the stirring up of conflict and continuation of bloodshed but consultations and talks, an end to interference and creation of a truly representative coalition government in Kabul.

East Europe

Hungarian Party-Opposition Talks Previewed

PM1606160189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent F. Lukyanov: "The Aim—National Consensus. A Roundtable of Members of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party and the Opposition Has Started Work in Budapest"]

[Text] Budapest—Last Saturday [10 June], in the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] Central Committee building, after long preliminary consultations which went on for several months, delegations from the MSZMP and opposition parties and organizations, now putting forward a joint platform called opposition roundtable, and a number of public and trade union organizations signed an agreement whereby talks in the context of a national roundtable begin on 13 June in the State Assembly's Hunters' Hall under the auspices of parliamentary president M. Szuros. It is assumed that the MSZMP delegation will be headed by MSZMP General Secretary K. Grosz.

...The talks participants who came to the MSZMP Central Committee building to meet with journalists did not conceal the fact that the agreement, signed a few seconds before and still being urgently copied for distribution to the meeting participants, is an important new milestone in Hungary's postwar political life following the MSZMP Central Committee February Plenum decision to switch to a multiparty system and is a significant success in the consolidation of all public forces on the path of further reforms. Although the talks themselves are yet to happen and many differences of opinion have to be overcome, a great deal has been accomplished. Most important of all:

The dialogue between the MSZMP, the ruling party, and all the country's new social and political forces is acquiring the status of official talks which are to draw up terms for the switch to a multiparty system in the country.

It must be said that since the informal, as they used to call themselves, then independent, and, finally, opposition organizations and parties appeared the MSZMP has never refused to conduct a dialogue with them. Late last year the party leadership said it was ready to cooperate, even in a coalition, with all the forces following the path of reforms. And it did not just talk about it. At the beginning of January 1989 there were the first consultations between representatives of the MSZMP and the biggest opposition organization, the Hungarian Democratic Forum, with 15,000 members. I was present at the meeting at the MSZMP Central Committee Higher Political School. It appeared then that, despite all the obvious differences, it would be possible to reach accords on many questions in the very near future. This impression was strengthened by the meetings that followed between MSZMP delegations and representatives of the Social Democratic Party and the Small Businessmen's Party....

The situation changed when the independent organizations and parties got together and created a single opposition roundtable bloc, deciding to act at the talks with the MSZMP as a unified alliance. The main reason for unification, according to the representatives of the opposition roundtable, was the fear that the MSZMP would take advantage of the fragmentary nature of the opposition and in that situation would be able to impose its own solutions. To all appearances, this turn of events put the MSZMP delegation in an awkward position. The roundtable organized on 8 April, in which it was assumed organizations would participate individually, was a failure, in fact. The opposition simply did not turn up.

Since then procedural matters have been the main stumbling block at the talks. "When will you decide what form of roundtable you want?" asks a carpenter, surrounded by representatives of parties and organizations, in a cartoon in the paper MAGYAR NEMZET, expressing, as it were, the concern of the country's public in connection with the protracted preparatory consultations, while the number of problems for joint solution remains the same. In the end a sense of responsibility for the country's future and a willingness to compromise to achieve national consensus emabled the sides, to give them their due, to get the talks out of the impasse. The two latest May plenums of the MSZMP Central Committee played a big part in this. If the opposition wants to act as a single bloc at the talks, then so be it. But, on the other hand, the roundtable is national, and therefore organizations that are not involved with either the MSZMP or the opposition roundtable must participate in it on an equal basis.

Albeit grudgingly, the opposition agreed to the participation of a number of public and trade union organizations in the talks. These are the Hungarian National Trade Union Council, the Hungarian National Council of Women, the Union of Hungarian Resistance Fighters and Antifascists and the Patriotic People's Front, the Hungarian Democratic Youth League (a revamped Communist Youth League), the Ferenc Myunnikh [surname as transliterated] Society, and an association called the Left Alternative. Thus, the participants in the national roundtable were decided on.

Clearly, a few words are need about the opposition bloc, which incorporated eight political parties and organizations. The most influential are the Hungarian Democratic Forum, mentioned above, the Hungarian People's Party, the Hungarian Social Democratic Party, and the Small Businessmen's Party.

The agreement states that the fundamental premise for starting negotiations is that all power is based on people's sovereignty, which no political force can appropriate. Nor can any political force call itself the sole mouthpiece for the people's will. Who expresses the people's will and to what extent, the document says, should be demonstrated by free elections on a multiparty basis.

As for the talks procedure, it is proposed that six or seven special commissions on a whole variety of topics will operate simultaneously at the plenary session. I asked the delegation leaders at the preparatory stage: MSZMP delegation leader Gyorgy Fejti, party Central Committee secretary, and opposition roundtable delegation leader Peter Tolgyesi, member of the Union of Free Democrats, to talk about specific matters which the sides plan to discuss at the roundtable.

What worries us most, P. Tolgyesi said, is legislative activity, the adoption of such laws as the law on parties, elections, the constitutional court, and so on. Despite the fact that practically no law is adopted without preliminary consultations with the opposition, the opposition roundtable members still believe that they are not being adequately consulted and therefore the flood of lawmaking must be halted and, perhaps, the discussion of these important laws by the Hungarian National Assembly switched to the end of June, until agreement has been reached on these topics at the roundtable.

MSZMP delegation leader G. Fejti believes that the roundtable talks will pay considerable attention to the country's economic problems. Perhaps government representatives will participate. Incidentally, the first consultations between the government and the opposition took place the other day. A new cabinet program, a change in the production structure, an anti-inflation policy, property reform, social guarantees for working people—there is no denying that there are plenty of questions for the upcoming dialogue to consider. It is true also that the MSZMP and the opposition have

different, sometimes diametrically opposite approaches to many problems. Of course, this in no way rules out the possibility of agreements. But it is clear that the talks will not be easy.

Further on Nagy 16 Jun Reburial Service Reported

'Anti-Soviet' Feelings Manifested

PM2006134789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Ceremony in Budapest"]

[Text] Budapest, 16 Jun—The reburial of the remains of former Hungarian Council of Ministers Chairman Imre Nagy and his supporters P. Maleter, M. Gimes, G. Losonczi, and J. Szilagyi took place today in the Hungarian capital. They were all found guilty of involvement in the 1956 counterrevolutionary rebellion and were sentenced by the court and executed. The funeral, held in one of the city's squares, was attended by around 250,000 inhabitants of the capital and other Hungarian cities and guests from abroad, including active participants in the 1956 events who had emigrated to the West.

At the place where the ceremony, organized by a number of opposition and alternative groupings, was being held, national flags had been hoisted. As in 1956, the part of the flag which, prior to the events of that time, had borne the Hungarian state coat of arms had been torn out

M. Szuros, chairman of the National Asssembly; M. Nemeth, chairman of the Council of Ministers; P. Medgyessy, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers; I. Pozsgay, minister of state; and representatives of opposition and alternative parties and organizations; religious figures; and heads of a number of diplomatic missions in Hungary participated in the official wreath laying. Wreaths were also laid by B. Craxi, political secretary of the Italian Socialist Party [PSI], on behalf of the PSI, and by A. Occhetto, secretary general of the Italian Communist Party [PCI], on behalf of the PCI.

During a rally on the square certain speakers made blatantly anti-Soviet attacks. They said that "gross interference by the USSR quelled the revolution in 1956 and put a stop to Hungarians' aspirations and hopes." One of the main things that prevented freedom from flourishing in Hungary, S. Racz, former chairman of the so-called Budapest workers' council in 1956, claimed, was the presence of Soviet troops on its territory. This presence, he continued, "casts a shadow over Hungarian life even today." V. Orban [name as transliterated], representative of the opposition union of young democrats, who took it on himself to speak for all young Hungarians, urged the "demolition of the communist dictatorship" and tried to intimidate the meeting by saying that "otherwise more Hungarians will go to their graves." According to him, "democracy and communism are incompatible."

At the end of the rally the funeral procession set off for a Budapest cemetery. A small party of relatives was present at the burial of I. Nagy and his supporters.

M. Nemeth granted the MTI press agency an interview in which he stressed that it is necessary to bring to a conclusion as soon as possible, in an atmosphere of public accord, the historical tragedy that caused so much grief and to focus Hungarians' efforts and attention on the people's welfare, on the future. He said that the present leadership, advancing together with the people along the path of political and economic reforms, will lay the foundation for a better and happier future for Hungary.

'Extremist Element' Criticized

LD2006084389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0647 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 20 Jun—TASS political observer Aleksandr Kondrashev writes:

The ceremony for the reburial of Imre Nagy which took place in Budapest 16 June and which had been conceived as a means of ruling off the tragic events of the past, as a way toward national reconciliation and concord in Hungarian society, unfortunately turned into something different. In contrast to the spirit itself of the atmosphere of mourning, the speeches of those representing the opposition forces with sharp attacks upon the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party [MSZMP], the Soviet Union, socialism, and the international obligations of the Hungarian People's Republic merely gave rise to a feeling of alarm and concern both within Hungary itself and in the other socialist countries.

Taking the most unbiased approach to the remarks that were heard at the ceremony, the majority of them cannot be accepted. For assertions like: "Hungary's 40 years of Soviet occupation," the "Asian impasse" into which it has driven the country, comparisons between Pol Pot and Li Peng or Jaruzelski are not arguments or even propaganda devices, but are in the category of abuse and insults. However, as I see it one should not minimize the significance of the jaundiced utterances of these "fighters against communist dictatorship."

At the funeral ceremony in Budapest on 16 June the program of the extremist element of the Hungarian opposition was presented in concentrated form. I should imagine it is now clearer to many that it is concerned not with making socialism in Hungary more human, nor with reflecting the "blank spots" in history in a comprehensive and balanced way, nor yet with bringing about economic reforms and raising the wellbeing of the people. A complete undermining of the MSZMP's position in society, the withdrawal from the country of the Soviet troops there within the framework of bilateral agreements and obligations under the Warsaw Pact, and at the same time the lumping of the blame for all the economic

problems and tragic pages in Hungarian history on the USSR—those are the main goals of several of the alternative and opposition groupings.

Of course, it must not be forgotten that those figures who spoke at the mourning ceremony represent quite narrow sections of Hungarian society. The vast majority of the country's population is in favor of friendship and alliance with the USSR. But all the greater is the bewilderment provoked by irresponsible assertions that the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary is somehow one of the obstacles to the flowering of freedom. It is obvious and commonly acknowledged that the Soviet Union is in no way interfering in the process of renewal in Hungary. The Soviet troops located in Hungary exclusively as a counterweight to the NATO forces in Europe are actually now being reduced and are leaving the Hungarian People's Republic [HPR]. On the contrary, the Soviet side has on more than one occasion stated its support and understanding for the process of renewal in the HPR, and the similarity beween many of the tasks being addressed by the Hungarian people and the tasks of restructuring in the USSR. More than that, one could previously hear even from the lips of alternative and opposition figures of the beneficial effect of Soviet restructuring on the process of democratization in Hungary. But now, judging by the utterances that have been voiced, the Soviet Union is counted among the enemies of the Hungarian reforms.

And not only the Soviet Union. Analyzing the statements by representatives of the opposition in the press and the campaigns organized by them with a clearly expressed line of conflict with regard to Romania and Czechoslovakia, an unambiguous conclusion can be drawn: It is being suggested to the public of the country that the enemies of Hungary are her socialist neighbors—the states of the Warsaw Pact.

It is no accident that the demonstration in Budapest gave rise to alarm and anxiety in Romania and Czechoslovakia. As J. Fojtik, member of the Presidium and secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee stated in a recent speech, "Certain circles in the West would like to regard the funeral ceremony for Imre Nagy as the symbolic burial of socialism in this country. We believe that on the contrary those that link Hungary's future with socialism will become more active. Without a doubt progressive people not only in our country wish the same thing."

Profound political and economic reforms and a new assessment of events and politicians in the country's history are an internal matter for the Hungarian people. But the development of Soviet-Hungarian friendship—this most valuable possession of our peoples—is a bilateral matter. The feelings of friendship and affection that the Soviet people have toward the Hungarian people are invariable. We believe that they are shared by the majority of Hungarians, too, who will do everything to ensure that the episode mentioned does not mar our relations.

'Chauvinist Notes' Struck at Funeral

PM1906153489 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Special correspondent B. Rodionov report: "Funeral Ceremony in Budapest"]

[Text] Budapest—The live broadcast of the funeral of Imre Nagy and four of his associates who were executed 31 years ago, in violation of procedural norms, for participating in the tragic contradictions of the October events of 1956—events that still await exhaustive scientific analysis—lasted for some 9 hours on Hungarian television and radio.

Government leaders and the chairman of the Hungarian National Assembly took part in the first part of the ceremony, held in the central Heroes' Square. Although the final decision of the Supreme Court on the legal rehabilitation of Imre Nagy has not yet been made (it is expected at the beginning of July), the Hungarian Government published a statement on the eve of the funeral characterizing Imre Nagy, who twice held the post of Hungarian head of government, as an outstanding statesman "who recognized the need to change a nonviable policy that was alien to our traditions, the need to implement national characteristics and unchanging human values." The events of 1956 are characterized in this document as a "people's uprising and a national tragedy."

The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and other responsible sociopolitical forces in the country sought to turn the funeral day into a day of historic reconciliation, of consolidation of the nation's forces in order to find a way out of the increasingly acute political and economic crisis. However, the country's leaders were not given the floor in Heroes' Square. The opposition was in charge at the funeral ceremony. Alongside elevated and realistic speeches, much was also said with which one cannot agree.

Some speakers who took part in the 1956 events called not for the learning of wise lessons from the national tragedy, but for the continuation of a "revolution" which, it was said openly from the platform, was suppressed by Soviet military interference. A demand was put forward for the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary and the pillorying of the "communist regime," "Moscowites," and "Kadarists."

Chauvinist notes were struck in some speeches. All this can hardly promote fruitful work at the nationwide "roundtable" or the development of harmonious relations between Hungary and its neighbors.

Today's newspapers publish an interview given by M. Nemeth, chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, to ABC television, in which the premier, without naming the author, categorically rejects the thesis put forward by M. Palmer, U.S. ambassador to Hungary, that "the Brezhnev doctrine is not dead yet," and that further Soviet interference in Hungary cannot be ruled out. Today, after Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's visit, such theses, which are taken up by some of the Hungarian mass media, sound particularly absurd. In general it can be said that the extremist calls met with little enthusiasm in the country. The atmosphere in Budapest remains completely calm.

Events Leading to Nagy's Death Described

PM2006142189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 89 p 3

[Own correspondent A. Kaverznev dispatch under the "Lessons of History" rubric: "Return. The Remains of Former Hungarian Prime Minister Imre Nagy, One of the Founders of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party, Were Reburied Yesterday in Budapest"]

[Text] Budapest—He was one of the founders of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] and a prominent figure in post-1945 history, who embodied the policy of socialist reforms—that is the view expressed in a recent MSZMP Central Committee statement. In the words of Imre Pozsgay, he was a hero whose behavior, steadfastness, and life are still an example to us all. The words of the judicial sentence and political assessments that were widespread until recently describe him as a revisionist and traitor, the organizer of a conspiracy aimed at overthrowing the people's democratic state system. Such diametrically opposed descriptions. Like water they reflected many of the contradictions inherent in the situation in Hungary in the mid-1950's.

The court sentenced Imre Nagy and several of his supporters to death 16 June 1958, and he was buried in an unmarked grave. This winter the Hungarian Council of Ministers adopted the decision to rebury the remains. The date chosen for the ceremony was no accident: 31 years to the day after the execution. Five men were buried: Imre Nagy, Miklos Gimes, Geza Losonczi, Pal Maleter, and Josef Sziladyi. But there were six coffins. The sixth was empty as a symbol. A tribute to the memory of the thousands of people who fought on both sides of the barricade in 1956 and perished in the fratricidal struggle.

I. Nagy was born in 1896 in Kaposvar. He began his working life as a worker. He fought in World War I and ended up in a Russian prison in 1916. From 1917 onward he was involved in the civil war in Siberia and joined the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). In the twenties he carried out illegal party work in Hungary and was arrested. He then emigrated to the USSR, worked in Communist International organs, and obtained Soviet citizenship. During the Great Patriotic War I. Nagy served in the Red Army, but he was later recalled to carry out propaganda work among Hungarian prisoners of war. He returned to Hungary after the country's liberation from fascism and held high party and government posts. By 1953 he had become quite well known as a politician. He became a member of the Hungarian Worker's Party Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers.

The year was 1953.... Stalin died in March. In the summer, after talks with the new Soviet leadership, the Hungarian Worker's Party Central Committee adopted a resolution condemning the personality cult and the leftist adventurist policy conducted by the then leadership headed by M. Rakosi. This was the first attempt to break with the Stalinist model of socialism, which had assumed an almost more monstrous form in Hungary than in the USSR. On his appointment as prime minister Imre Nagy proclaimed a new course. It was a question of slowing down the rate of industrialization in view of Hungary's potential and specific features, changing the proportions in the development of heavy and light industry, giving individual peasant farmers considerable assistance, restoring legality, and so on. The "new course" above all meant the course of democratizing Hungarian socialist society. Who knows, if it had proved possible to fulfill the decisions of the Hungarian Worker's Party Central Committee July Plenum and the government, maybe the bloody fall of 1956 would not have happened.

But there were no substantial changes. Rakosi, who remained in the post of party first secretary, confined himself to half-measures. Through behind-the-scenes struggle he strove to oust Nagy from the post of prime minister. He was expelled from the party.

In 1956 the 20th CPSU Congress condemned the crimes of the "personality cult." Words were heard from the congress platform regarding the importance of taking national features and specific historical conditions for building socialism into consideration. There was no sign of perceptible change in Hungary. Rakosi had no intention of relinquishing his position. The people's standard of living and the party's prestige declined rapidly.

Opposition began to mass around I. Nagy even before Rakosi's dismissal. It is hard to disagree with the opinion of the investigators, who reckoned that it was not so much that Nagy assembled people as that they picked him, seeing him as an alternative to Rakosi. The core of the opposition was made up primarily of representatives of the intelligentsia. Although at first they had no clear program, the popularity of Nagy's group grew rapidly. When many thousands of students and workers came out onto the streets to demonstrate in October, one of the demonstrators' main demands was for Imre Nagy to be put at the head of the government.

All the circumstances behind the events must be studied in a well-considered and painstaking fashion in view of the prevailing historical realities in order to impartially assess Nagy's activity in the tragic days of 1956. Although reams have been written about this, we still have to painstakingly study documents under lock and key in various countries.

At present, without going into details, let us note the following. At the Hungarian Worker's Party Central Committee session on the night of 24 October Imre Nagy, elected member of the Politburo and appointed prime minister, strove wholeheartedly to avoid bloodshed and restore order in the country. Moreover, it must particularly be stressed that he firmly intended to preserve the socialist system. He hoped to do this in the intricate and ever-changing situation through compromise and concessions to rightist forces. However, Nagy's inconsistency in the decisions he adopted during the 11 days he headed the government cannot fail to strike us. I. Nagy, like the leadership as a whole, was not always in control of the situation, issuing statements that were not founded on the real state of affairs. The prime minister was unable to assess the international consequences of his foreign policy steps and speeches—making statements about Hungary's neutrality and withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact and an appeal to the United Nations for help. All this led to a bloody denouement and personal tragedy for Nagy himself. Obviously, under those conditions a more flexible yet resolute leader was needed, a man of outstanding organizational ability. It was not Imre Nagy's fault but rather his misfortune that he was clearly unequal to his position. Although, of course, it is easy for us to argue and make assessments some 30-odd years later.... However, it is a fact that Nagy's multiparty government, whose composition changed daily, was ineffectual. Chaos grew in the country. A real threat arose to the socialist system.

The creation of a revolutionary worker-peasant government headed by Janos Kadar, which appealed to the Soviet Government for aid, was announced at dawn 4 November. The decision to bring in additional Soviet troop units to defeat the counterrevolutionary forces was taken by the Supreme Soviet leadership after consultations with the leaders of the Warsaw Pact states, China, and Yugoslavia. At 0520 hours Imre Nagy made a radio statement.

"Soviet units," he said, "have undertaken an offensive against our capital clearly aimed at overthrowing the legitimate Hungarian democratic government. Our units are fighting, the government is in place."

The statement, to put it mildly, did not accord with reality. P. Maleter, minister of the armed forces, had already been arrested and I. Nagy himself sought refuge in the Yugoslav Embassy very soon together with a dozen staffers and members of their families. Some time later they were taken to Romania and interned. The investigation began the following spring. Then the well-known sentence was passed after a show trial.

A MSZMP Central Committee statement published 1 June this year notes Imre Nagy's role in the country's life in the fifties, especially October 1956—a role which was in many respects contradictory and unequivocal but was nonetheless outstanding. The death sentence has been bluntly described as wrong and passed for political motives.

The Hungarian supreme prosecutor demanded the juridical rehabilitation of Imre Nagy and his nine comrades in arms 9 June. The prosecutor's protest contained eight points, from which it emerges that the organs of justice violated current legal procedure in 1958. Incidentally, one point says that Nagy and his comrades had a written guarantee from the Hungarian Government that they would not be persecuted. The Hungarian Supreme Court will set about reviewing the case 6 July. The abrogation of the illegal sentence will mark Nagy's full rehabilitation. Work is also under way to review other cases that were fabricated under Rakosi.

Nagy's rehabilitation and the reburial of his remains is not simply a symbolic and humane act. The entire process of reviewing and reappraising the events of 1956 is of profound political significance. Both the MSZMP Central Committee statement and the Hungarian Government statement link Nagy's name with the struggle against Stalinism and the struggle to form the people's front policy and for the path of socialist development that presupposes self-management, a democratic multiparty system, and pluralism based on national independence and sovereignty. These are in effect the main political ideas that Hungarian Communists are now working to implement. The MSZMP Central Committee statement reads as follows: "In the course of its renewal the party is maintained by the principles proclaimed on its creation at the end of October 1956, openly acknowledging the ideas of the 1953-1954 reforms as its heritage." The party has urged all Hungarians to make 16 June National Reconciliation Day.

I could have ended here. But I cannot fail to recall that our officers and men also perished in 1956. How many died? I have not come across any figure in the press. Since we have begun to paint in the "blank spots" in our history and since our Hungarian comrades are full of determination to seek and tell the whole truth about 1956, the activity of the Soviet leadership and other socialist countries at that time must also be assessed. This is clearly no easy matter.

We must know the truth for the sake of the memory of the Soviet troops who died in Hungary. I think that the truth would only strengthen the trust between our peoples.

Marosan Memoires on Nagy Era Published

PM1606094189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Book review by candidate of historical sciences B. Shestakov under the rubric "Notes on Books": "Living Witnesses"]

[Text] "Living Witnesses" is the title of the latest memoirs published in Budapest recently by Gyorgy Marosan, the well-known figure of the Hungarian Communist and Workers' Movement.

The author's name is indissolubly linked with the political battles of the postwar years. That was when this bakery worker rose to become the acknowledged leader of the Hungarian social democratic movement and then of the Hungarian Workers' Party. In the fifties the Rakosi regime sentenced him to death on false charges but did not manage—or did not intend?—to carry the sentence out. Together with J. Kadar in November 1956, G. Marosan entered the Hungarian revolutionary worker-peasant government which, after breaking with I. Nagy, found its own radical way out of the crisis. After this Marosan became the second-most important figure in the party and state leaderships of the country. Six years later he unexpectedly retired....

G. Marosan's memoirs are noteworthy also because they deal with a question which is being vigorously debated now: What actually happened in Hungary in 1956—was it a people's uprising or a counterrevolution? The new book covers the period from September 1956 through December 1957. Tracing as an eye-witness the process of growing sociopolitical crisis, analyzing the sectarian dogmatist course of M. Rakosi, the activity of the I. Nagy grouping, and the intrigues of reaction at home and abroad, the author draws the following main conclusions. In 1956 the opponents of socialism of all sections and ranks not only formed a united front but also joined for tactical reasons with the opposition within the party on certain questions: Thus events gradually developed into a counterrevolutionary revolt.

Page by page, Marosan contests the version of the "people's uprising." In his opinion, such an interpretation of the events is incompatible with the brutality at the Budapest party city committee; the storming of the radio building; the capture of the arsenal; the siege of the Kilian barracks and the "Jozsef" telephone exchange; the armed clashes in Gyor, Sopron, Magyarovar, Szekesfehervar, Miskolc, and Zalaegerszeg; the lynching of Communists; and the blood of hundreds of innocent civilians.

More than once the author deals in the book with episodes linked with activity during those tragic days of I. Nagy—the prominent figure carried to the top on a wave of political events in October 1956. As is well known, in the near future Nagy's remains, which have rested till now in a cemetery in the outskirts of Budapest after his execution in 1958 by order of a military tribunal, are to be reinterred.

In his critical assessment of Nagy's position and personal qualities, G. Marosan unambiguously shares the viewpoint of J. Kadar, who stated on radio at that time: "The peaceful demonstration begun by a section of our young people, most of whom were pursuing positive aims, turned in a few hours into an armed attack against the power of the people's democratic state—which was the intention of the anti-people and counterrevolutionary elements which joined in." This wording, the author believes, is equally significant 33 years on.

...Restructuring and the desire for the revolutionary renewal of socialism require in Hungary, as in our country, that heightened attention be paid to the lessons of the past. Black-and-white pictures depicting a particular aspect of the complex mosaic of historical events do not help here. Only on the basis of a comprehensive, multihued understanding of the dialectics of political struggle is it possible to ensure the consolidation of all social forces and thereby find a way out of the present crisis situation and build the future constructively.

Yet it happened...it all happened.... There was righteous anger among the masses, who refused to identify the Rakosi regime with true socialism. And blood was shed on the streets of Hungarian cities by people who had waited years for their moment to act against socialism. Thus, on the complex path of getting to know and understand the truth and in the conditions of today's pleasing desire for pluralism, we need the full range of opinions—those of G. Marosan and of other living witnesses of the tragic events.

Demonstrators Gather at USSR Budapest Embassy

LD1706133789 Moscow International Service in Hungarian 1900 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Excerpts] [Presenter] Our special correspondent Yuriy Rogov is at the microphone:

[Rogov] [passage omitted] I was amazed at the news reporting the demonstration which took place outside the Soviet Embassy [in Budapest]. The demonstrators—it is true, they were few in number—called the Soviet soldiers, who drove fascism from Hungarian soil at the expense of great human sacrifice, occupiers. I think that many thousands of Budapest residents do not agree with these slogans, people who were saved from starvation by Soviet soldiers, and the many hundreds of people who were saved at the time of the tragic Tisza flood, and the many, many inhabitants of distant villages to whom red-starred vehicles broke a path in the times of unusually heavy snowfall, and took bread and milk to them.

We truly live under a common roof, and this roof is for the moment, rather fragile. The waves of confrontation wish to sweep away [word indistinct], they would like to

demolish everything of value which we have attained and accumulated. Just for this reason, it depends on us, the citizens of the countries of the socialist community, to find the constructive approach to the solution of the common problems facing the European peoples. And in this, it is solidarity, not division which can help us, joint efforts within the country and in international relations, too. Only in this way can we preserve the beautiful construction of our common European home for our descendants.

Polish Sejm, Senate Elections Reported

2d Round Takes Place 19 Jun

PM2006152589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 89 Second Edition pp 1, 4

[Anatoliy Starukhin dispatch under the rubric "Abroad": "Task for a 'Grand Coalition'"]

[Text] Warsaw, 19 Jun—The second round of elections to the Sejm and the country's Senate has been held in Poland. In the second round of voting Sejm deputies were elected to the 295 seats still vacant after the first round, along with 8 senators. Most seats in the Sejm were contested only by candidates from parties and organizations in the ruling coalition. In accordance with the political contract concluded in the spring at the "round table," 65 percent of seats in the Sejm have been allocated to the coalition and 35 percent to the opposition. In the first round the opposition, in the shape of candidates from the "Solidarity" Citizens Committee, won virtually all the seats allocated for nonparty people in the Sejm, as well as 92 of the 100 seats in the Senate, where elections were held with no restrictions on either side.

Yesterday I visited polling station No 274 in the capital's Ochota district. Electoral commission chairman Edward Weglarek stated in a businesslike way: "The atmosphere is normal, everything's going smoothly." And he added: "Very smoothly even. There have been fewer people today."

We were looking at a typical picture. Indeed, the voters were considerably less active in the second round than they had been on 4 June. Only approximately one-fourth of the people entitled to vote showed up again at the polling places. The level of citizens' activeness naturally tells us a great deal.

Above all, the local press is noting, it demonstrates the population's fatigue and its dissatisfaction with rising prices, the shortages of consumer goods and foodstuffs, the mistakes made in previous years, the inefficacy of measures and decisions, and unfulfilled promises.

As TRYBUNA LUDU wrote, the people did not so much vote for the "Solidarity" candidates and cross off the ballot paper the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] representatives—against whom they had no specific complaints—as simply refuse to trust the old forms of government which had brought the country to the brink of a crisis.

Leading Polish politicians and public figures admit that the election campaign—which turned out badly for the forces involved with the leadership of the country—merely confirmed the emergence of a qualitatively new sociopolitical situation in people's Poland, brought about by the substantial democratic decisions made recently. After all, at the end of the day it was the PZPR that initiated the "roundtable," which resulted in a mutual agreement between previously opposed sides, the legalization of "Solidarity," and the resolution of a whole range of serious problems. In the new situation, too, the country is to be ruled by the already cohesive alliance of these diverse forces. Not a coalition of three parties, but—as W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, said on the eve of the second round—a "grand coalition."

The PZPR and allied parties are now trying to analyze the election results and the unusual political situation in greater depth in order to determine the most effective ways of working in the future.

According to the Polish Constitution, the Council of State must convene the newly elected Sejm and Senate for their first session within a month of election day. After the election of the marshal of the Sejm, the National Assembly—a joint session of the Sejm and Senate—will be convened to elect the Polish president. Under the constitution this must take place within 2 months of the elections.

Poles Reject 'Extreme Wing'

PM1906114589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 89 p 3

[Own correspondent V. Shutkevich dispatch: "Sunday Is a Working Day"]

[Text] Warsaw—The second round of the elections to the Sejm and Senate is being held in Poland today [18 June].

The first round, as is known, ended in victory for the opposition, whose candidates managed to gain 92 of the 100 seats in the country's Senate. Only two of the 35 candidates of the ruling coalition on the so-called national list were elected as Sejm deputies. On the decision of the Polish State Council, supplementary elections will decide to whom the remaining deputy mandates will go. Literally 4 days before the second round, the names of the 66 candidates for these seats put forward by the ruling coalition were published. It is noteworthy that they include more young public figures, leaders of youth organizations such as Grzegorz Dittrich,

chairman of the Main Board of the Union of Socialist Polish Youth, and D. Wojtszak, vice president of the Main Council of the Polish Scout Union, and others.

The position of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] on the eve of the second round of the elections was formulated by M. Rakowski, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, on Thursday [15 June] at a meeting with Worclaw Party activists. Admitting that the ruling coalition had underestimated its political opponent during the first round, he stressed: The main demand now is to adopt an active, assertive stance. To move on from the depression, disillusionment, and bitterness caused by the defeat in the first round to resolute actions, and to seek persistently to gain the electorates' votes and the support of the whole of society. It remains our party's historical obligation, M. Rakowski noted, to build democratic socialism in Poland free from all relics of Stalinism and open to all the realities of the present time. The best form of running the country in the present conditions would be a broad government coalition of all the forces represented in parliament. It is possible, however, M. Rakowski said, that we, together with our allies, will have to assume all executive power in the future, too. In any case, the opposition should be aware of its responsibility for the situation in the country. The opposition, according to his words, must also understand that if in one of the countries of the Warsaw Pact power passes to a group of politicians who are openly supported by the governments of NATO countries, the threat of a dangerous confict and destabilization in Europe and in the whole world will arise.

And what about the opposition itself? On the one hand, there are sober voices, as it were, warning about not getting carried away with the victory in the first round and assessing the situation and own resources soberly.

On the other hand, the resounding success of "Solidarity" during the first round has galvanized extremist groupings which reject any form of participation in a coalition and demand of L. Walesa that he "grab the power which is within his reach."

However such moods do not find support among the overwhelming majority of Poles. This is borne out by the fact that not a single candidate from the extreme wing of the opposition was elected to the country's parliament during the first round.

Commentary on Polish Election Scene

PM1906104589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS correspondent V. Runov commentary: "Poland: Before the Second Round of the Elections"]

[Text] According to an unwritten law, summer in Poland is the "silly season" when the pace of life subsides to a minimum, the TASS correspondent in Warsaw reports to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. People are either already relaxing, or getting ready for their vacations. This year is different. The bags and suitcases have been pushed aside, the country's life continues to be dominated by the elections to the National Assembly. However, hardly anyone shows any interest in the procedure of the elections themselves now. The alignment of forces in the future parliament became obvious immediately after the first round of the elections.

Certain commentators believe that the current elections have not been entirely democratic since the parliamentary mandates were divided up in advance. This is arguable. However, it is what is demanded by the evolutionary path of development adopted by the "roundtable," the need to preserve continuity of power, and a gradual transition to a new democratic system. The spirit of democracy must become established in people's consciousness and then, only 4 years from now, the elections to the Sejm and the Senate will take place without a division of mandates, that is on a fully democratic basis.

The election participants understand this perfectly. If events were to be accelerated, social processes might get out of control.

After the first round of the elections, the sides declared that they intend to abide by the accords which were achieved at the "roundtable." During a recent session of the conciliation commission which includes all political parties a common desire was expressed to cooperate during the so-called transitional period. The authorities and the opposition have recognized that for the time being the authorities must remain the authorities, and the opposition must remain the opposition. And no one intends to disturb this alignment of forces within the next 4 years.

Making a realistic assessment of the situation, one of the leading representatives of "Solidarity" wrote recently in GAZETA WYBORCZA that the biggest danger now is the dizziness brought on by success. Calculations must not be based merely on the number of ballot papers. The situation is such that it is better for "Solidarity" to refrain from assuming power. However, it has clearly defined plans for the future. As prominent "Solidarity" adviser Jacek Kuron said a few days ago, "The opposition is interested in gradually changing the correlation of forces in its favor." This needs to be done in step with the restructuring in all echelons of power—in the Sejm and the Senate, in the organs of regional self-government, in societies and unions. In this the opposition counts on constructive cooperation with party reformers among others. If this does not occur, conflict will be unavoidable.

Adam Michnik, another "Solidarity" leader, has also expressed himself relatively clearly. In a commentary on the second round of the elections he writes that the opposition will vote above all for "Solidarity" candidates in order to ensure that it is as strong as possible in the National Assembly. However, it will also vote for

members of the Polish United Workers Party so as to elect its opponents and partners. Opponents who will observe the rules of political struggle and partners who are capable of cooperation in the process of building a democratic order.

Polish Figures Comment

LD2006223189 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 20 Jun 89

[From the "European Reporter" feature]

[Excerpts] For the first time since the Second World War Poland has held multicandidate elections with the governing parties and the opposition contesting the seats in the Upper House or Senate and the Lower House or the Sejm. [passage omitted]

The elections returns, as you probably know, were rather disapointing for the Polish United Workers' Party and the coalition government. They received only one seat in the upper house and the stipulated 65 percent in the lower house. At a news conference the Polish Workers' party secretary (Stanislaw Przezcek) (phon. untr.) was asked whether the election results signalled the death of communism in Poland. His reply took many by surprise: It's always better to die a glorious death said Mr (Przezek). But, continuing in a more serious vein, he said the party had to analyze the election returns very attentively and earnestly, reappraise its role in the country's life. It had to rid itself of all remnants of past mistakes and of a pro-Stalinist structure, ideology and spirit. It has to become a party of the people and for the people. There was no other way out declared (Stanislaw Przezek).

While in Warsaw recently our correspondent Peter Vasilyev talked to the party spokesman Jan Bisztyga:

[Begin Bisztyga recording] This is a...[changes thought] calls for deeper analysis, deeper sociological research, studies of the result and also a study of the mood and involvement of various social groups in this process of democratizing the country. I wish to stay the (?prognosis) concerning the turnout proved wrong. We will accept any result of the elections which will allow to conduct and to continue to develop the policy of reforms and to continue something that we call the policy of agreement, reforms and [words indistinct] reform coalition. This is very important from the point of view of the Polish nation, and this is something that we call the victory of Poland (?in) these elections. [end recording]

[Announcer] Jan Bisztyga.

It is clear that there can no longer be a single party political system in Poland. Although Solidarity is not a political party it's a political force no one can any longer ignore. It has been said repeatedly that the two sides have to work jointly towards agreement on political and economic issues. This means there has to be a balance of political forces in the country. Is it possible to achieve such a balance? Peter Vasilyev put this question to the president of the Steelworkers' Trade Union, Alfred Miodwicz:

[Begin Miodowicz recording] I believe that what is desirable here is a coalition government. It's very hard to foresee what course events will take among many dangers you can envisage or expect different government crises, (?the fact) that we have economic instability and (?so is) the system of running it, and under way are deep running reforms which call for plenty of resolve, determination, and they call for one distinct coherent line. [end recording]

[Announcer] Are the Poles likely to sign a balance [as heard] and to make the process of reforms irreversible? Here's what the Polish information minister Jerzy Urban thinks:

[Begin Urban recording] I don't think that anybody could tell you what is the arrangement of (?forces) because actually you must say that a first test of the balance of forces will be seen at the turn of the third and fourth quarter when we face problems in our economy which are already looming there, and then we see what is the real arrangement of forces and the arrangement of forces is changeable andd is only transitory, temporary (?narrow base). Now if an equilbrium (?balance) possible, yes it is possible, it will be, if we have a society which is realistic. Then we have full political, trade union and social pluralism. But we are far from that. [end recording]

[Announcer] The opposition, despite an invitation from the government and President Jaruzelski dodged the issue of joining the coalition government, wishing to remain an opposition force. However Solidarity agreed to work together with the new Polish Government, which is to be chosen by the first parliamentary session to be convened, probably this month. Peter Vasilyev asked the Solidarity spokesman Janusz Onyszkiewicz whether he believed such cooperation could be productive and businesslike:

[Begin Onyszkiewicz recording] Well if one analyzes the present situation (?in Poland) from the point of view of the result of the election one can say first of all that there are several factors. One is a relatively low turnout. This relatively low turnout we think is partly the result of low expectations of the electorate and this is an important factor. The elections, which are being run in the way of extremely high expectations, in atmosphere of enthusiasm, could in future turn out into bitter disappointment, so I think that the low expectations which was seen during the electoral campaign and which was manifested by relatively low turnout is something on the whole stabilizing. There is less chance of outburst of frustration, outburst of disappointment in the future. The government and the party is committed to peaceful transition from present political situation to more democratic situation in the country and as far as great

coalition between Solidarity and the government is concerned the thing is this, that during out electoral campaign we kept informing our electorate that we are going to the parliament and to the Senate as an opposition group, not as potential partner in the ruling coalition. So we are quite ready to cooperate with the government on issue by issue basis and if we agree on particular issues, particular solutions, as very often happens in democratic countries. [end recording]

[Announcer] Solidarity's spokesman Janusz Onyszkiewicz. And what is the view of Polish United Workers' Party spokesman Jan Bisztyga:

[Begin Bisztyga recording] What is most important Solidarity is not presenting comprehensive program of the future, of the future (?evolution) of Poland, of the future reforms. What there is debate for the treatment of solidarity program, there is the agreement of roundtable discussions. [sentence as heard] So what it was agreed there, it created common program of all forces sitting round, including Solidarity. But Solidarity is basing their electoral program on this problem they was not agreed [as heard] during the roundtable discussions. I could say that maybe that this is not fair approach to base the program on the not agreed elements of the mutual negotiations. But that is their opinion as the opposition. So my opinion is that this not agreed in (?problem) could be resolved in the further policy of parliament's decisions, Sejm's and Senate decisions and cooperation of all these (?parties) in the parliament. [end recording]

[Announcer] Party spokesman Jan Bisztyga. The question is whether the tone of such a dialogue is the right and proper one for the Poles, who, according to the election returns, identify the Polish Workers' Party with the Stalinist past. Such an image naturally cannot help win democratic elections. Renewal in society has to start with renewal in the party itself, to turn it from a bureaucratic body into a party of the people and social progress. And that's exactly the point which was made by President Wojciech Jaruzelski and this is the direction in which the party appears to be moving.

Gorbachev Overflies Poland, Greets Jaruzelski

AU1606085789 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 13 Jun 89 p 1

[Greetings message from Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU general secretary and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to Wojciech Jaruzelski, Polish United Workers Party first secretary and chairman of the Polish People's Republic State Council, sent while flying over Polish territory en route to Bonn on 12 June]

[Text] Comrade Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee and chairman of the Polish People's Republic [PPR] State Council.

While flying over PPR territory, I convey to you and the entire fraternal Polish people cordial greetings of lasting peace and success in effectively implementing the line of reform and socialist renewal. It is my profound belief that the development of good-neighborly relations and productive cooperation between the Soviet Union and the PPR accords with the basic long-term interests of the peoples of our two countries and the cause of stability and development in Europe.

[Signed] Mikhail Gorbachev

French President Mitterrand Visits Poland

Meets With Jaruzelski 15 Jun

PM1906105989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 89 First Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Overcoming Barriers"]

[Text] Warsaw, 15 Jun—W. Jaruzelski, chairman of the Polish Council of State, and French President F. Mitterrand, who is in Poland on an official visit, have expressed the intention to contribute to detente and to promote the successful development in Europe of the process initiated in Helsinki. During their meeting they stated their peoples' desire to overcome the barriers which still exist for the sake of constructing an "all-European home."

The sides noted the need to preserve and strengthen the progress achieved in bilateral relations and to develop trade and economic cooperation, whose state still does not accord with existing opportunities. From this viewpoint great importance will attach to the complete normalization of financial and credit relations. The French president cited as one of the main aims of his visit the intention to study what France can do to render specific support to the process of reforms in Poland. Their success will be of important significance going beyond the borders of one state, he noted.

The real idea of a safe, prosperous, truly "all-European" home is now emerging, W. Jaruzelski said at the dinner in F. Mitterrand's honor. The Yalta and Potsdam territorial structure inextricably connected with the inviolability of European borders makes possible the positive development of the Helsinki process. The further reduction of arms is of important significance. While retaining diversity in state structure and national and cultural features, Europe can become an example of detente and cooperation for the whole world.

In his answering speech F. Mitterrand stressed that he links great hopes with the future of the continent and believes in the need for the existence of a peaceful and united Europe. The idea of a "common European home" put forward by M.S. Gorbachev is a fine formula. It is very important that the Soviet leadership is speaking of a common future. Noting the great importance of the

disarmament process and the strengthening of security for all, the president expressed satisfaction at the start of the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe.

Mitterrand, Jaruzelski Cited

PM2006092189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by unnamed own correspondent: "Return to the Wisla: F. Mitterrand in Poland"]

[Text] Warsaw—French head of state Francois Mitterrand was in Poland 3 days—14 through 16 June—on an official visit.

It was his first trip to Poland since he became the incumbent of the Elysee Palace in 1981. The rather cool if not, to put it more accurately, tense relations between the two European countries which in the past were linked by ties which were not only close and friendly but also it may be said cordial, had lasted as many years. A certain warming came in late 1985, when W. Jaruzelski visited Paris. At that time a broad exchange of opinions on the state of Polish-French relations took place between him and the French president.

What was the reason for their low level? I think the answer is as simple as it is complex: The internal social conflict in Poland, which became so explosive that the need arose to introduce martial law. The conflict has in fact already become a matter of history. The sides which took part in it have nothing to divide, because if they did only Poland could be divided. They are seeking to implement the idea of national consensus and the profound democratization of social life, won at the cost of acute conflicts which have aggravated the considerable economic difficulties. The country is proceeding along the path of reforms and democratic transformations and thanks to the "roundtable" and the parliamentary elections the opposition has become a legal part of the state structures. All this has been welcomed with sympathy in the world and, of course, in France, too.

During the meetings and talks with Polish leaders and public figures the French side, represented not only by the president but also by six ministers and a group of businessmen and cultural figures (including the well-known writer F. Sagan) repeatedly stressed the importance of the radical changes taking place in Poland and the desire to promote them and to help Poland to emerge from the difficult financial and economic situation.

On the very first day of the stay on Polish soil several agreements were signed concerning cooperation between the Polish and French governments, youth exchanges, environmental conservation, the training of leading cadres at enterprises, and financial questions. In particular it was decided to suspend for 4 years the payment of Polish debts to France.

Addressing a reception held in his honor, the French president devoted a considerable part of his speech to problems of economic cooperation with Poland. He cited as the most important aim of his visit the study of what France could do to specifically support the reform process in Poland. Our economic and trade exchanges, the president said, should find a new point of departure. We are prepared to make the conditions of our credit policy and the financing of specific projects even more flexible, he stressed. Three priority spheres were highlighted: industrial projects, enterprises for processing agricultural output, and tourism. The president promised that France will set other countries an example in rendering aid to Poland to overcome its difficult stage and will be its advocate in the "Paris club."

"France and Poland," F. Mitterrand said, "expect a great deal from each other. They can begin to create a new model for relations between the divided parts of Europe."

Apart from Warsaw the eminent guest also visited Gdansk, where he met with L. Walesa, the leader of the "Solidarity" trade union, and Krakow and Auschwitz. The president described his impressions of his tour of the country and the meetings he had had at a press conference in Warsaw on the evening of 16 June.

According to W. Jaruzelski, the importance of many abstract concepts, particularly in the economic sphere, is being checked during the French president's visit. Honest partnership and an understanding of the complex Polish problems are needed here. That is why, the Polish leader said, we want "France's return to the Wisla" to be reflected in the modernization and reconstruction of our national economy, in science, technology, and culture.

Polish newspapers are noting the qualitative changes in Polish-French relations and in that sense the enormous importance of F. Mitterrand's visit. The improvement of these relations is in the interests of both East and West, in the interests of what is called our "common European home."

Yefimov Sees Off Departing Polish Air Force Chief

PM2006110189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jun 89 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Departure for Home"]

[Text] Division General T. Krawczyc, commander of the Polish Air Force, has completed his official visit to the Soviet Union.

Division General T. Krawczyc and the officials accompanying him visited the Professor N.Ye. Zhukovskiy Air Engineering Academy, the Kiev Higher Military Air Engineering School, and the Cosmonaut Training Center.

The Polish guests were informed about the substance and progress of restructuring in the USSR Armed Forces and the improvement of the training system for air engineering cadres, had meetings at troop collectives, and were familiarized with the sights of the hero-cities of Moscow and Kiev.

Division General T. Krawczyc left Moscow for home 15 June. He was seen off at Sheremetyevo Airport by Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Force and USSR deputy defense minister, and other Soviet generals and officers.

The send-off party included Brigade General A. Czernow, military, naval, and Air Force attache at the Polish Embassy in the USSR.

Jakes Speaks at Czechoslovak Plenum 14 Jun

PM1606095589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "M. Jakes Speech"]

[Text] The 14th Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee Plenum began its work in Prague yesterday [14 June]. Milos Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, delivered a report on the party's activity and its tasks. He emphasized that the majority of Czechoslovak people associate their hopes with the socialist path of development and the policy of restructuring and democratization. When assessing the situation in society, we do not lose sight of the existence of a series of domestic policy, economic, and ideological factors which influence people's specific views and positions, M. Jakes said. Foreign policy factors and the growing hostile propaganda also have an effect. Some Communists are becoming uncertain about a series of questions concerning the further development of socialism and the party's leading role.

We perceive restructuring as the renewal of socialism in its Leninist concept, as a rejection of everything that is alien to socialist values and blocks the path of Czechoslovak society's development, M. Jakes noted.

Milo Jakes Cited on Restructuring in CSSR

LD1706120889 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Text] Prague June 17 TASS—Perestroyka which was launched in Czechoslovakia is effected in the name of solidifying socialism, increasing the dynamic of society's development and upgrading people's life, Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee, told a congress of the Czechoslovak Women's Union currently in session in Prague.

The country faces complex tasks, Jakes said. Their accomplishment is impossible without a vigorous involvement of women representing a great social force. This also determines the union's role and place in the Czechoslovak National Front, the importance of its activity to give an impetus to the women's movement, create favourable conditions for women's life and work and for upbringing children.

The Czechoslovak leader described in detail progress in the reform of the economic mechanism, the process to deepen socialist democracy. He noted that a constructive dialogue can be conducted only with those who retain basic respect for the results of other people's labour, who are ready to respect other people's views and do not intend to impose in an ultimatum from the views of individuals on the majority.

In conclusion Jakes assured the delegates of the congress that Czechoslovakia is at one with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, with all peace-minded forces of the world will continue to take an active part in asserting new political thinking in inter-state relations, work for disarmament, creating a reliable mechanism of international security, and promoting trust and coooperation among nations.

Czechoslovak Central Committee Confers 9 Jun

PM1606085789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Session of Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee Presidium"]

[Text] Prague, 9 Jun—A session of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee Presidium has been held here, CTK reports.

The session participants discussed the CPCZ Central Committee's draft report on the party's activity in the period since the 13th CPCZ Central Committee Plenum and its further tasks, which will be delivered by M. Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, at the 14th plenum on 14 June.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium also discussed the draft report on one of the items from the forthcoming plenum's program, which will be delivered by F. Hanus, secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

The session examined some organizational questions relating to the preparation for the 18th CPCZ Congress and elaborated recommendations on the elections of deputies to district, city, and regional party conferences and to the congress of the Slovak Communist Party.

There was a report on the progress of work on the draft political-legal principles of the new CSSR Constitution relating to national committees.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium took note of the report on the course and results of the friendly working visit to the CSSR by G. Atanasov, chairman of

the Bulgarian Council of Ministers, and on the conference in Berlin of Central Committee secretaries in charge of economic questions from the socialist countries' fraternal parties.

Bulgaria's Zhivkov Receives USSR's Gusev 16 Jun
PM1906154289 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Todor Zhivkov Receives USSR Deputy Council of Ministers' Chairman"]

[Text] Sofia, 16 Jun—T. Zhivkov, general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, today received V.K. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who is here on a visit.

During the talk there was an exchange of information on the course of restructuring in the two fraternal countries, and opportunities for further developing cooperation in the new economic management conditions were discussed.

It was decided to draw up in the near future long-term decisions in the priority spheres that were indicated, and to sign intergovernmental agreements.

P. Danchev, candidate member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Bulgarian "Biotechnological and Chemical Industry" association, took part in the talk.

Yazov, Bulgaria's Dzhurov Hold 17 Jun Talks
LD1706141489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1334 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 17 Jun (TASS)—Army General Dobri Dzhurov, member of the Politburo of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee and minister of national defense of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, was in Moscow today on a working visit. He had a meeting with Army General Dmitriy Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense. During the meeting, which passed in an atmsophere of friendship and complete unanimity, matters of mutual interest were discussed.

Army Gen Yazov reported on the results of the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies, implementation of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the 19th all-union party conference and plenums of the party Central Committee, and progress in restructuring throughout the country and in the Soviet Army forces.

Army Gen Dzhurov spoke of progress in carrying out the decisions of the national party conference and plenums of the BCP Central Committee directed at a renewal of all spheres of social life in the country.

The ministers discussed matters relating to a further development and deepening of cooperation in the military sphere, and a strengthening of links and contacts between the armies of the two countries. They also considered problems connected with implementation of a defensive military doctrine and of the decisons that have been adopted on a reduction of armed forces.

Army General Petr Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the joint armed forces of the Warsaw Pact member states, and other officials of both sides took part in the meeting.

Biryukova Meets Bulgarian Consumer Goods Producers
PM1906082189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Talks Held"]

[Text] On 14 June A.P. Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received a delegation of leaders of Bulgarian enterprises producing consumer goods headed by Ye. Zlateva, chairman of the "Industry for Man" association.

A.P. Biryukova briefed them on the Soviet Government's work on resolving the problem of saturating the market with consumer goods. Questions of deepening Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation in the sphere of consumer goods production on the basis of enhancing the efficiency of direct and collaborative ties and creating joint ventures were discussed.

The talks took place in a warm and comradely atmosphere.

USSR's Silayev, SFRY Ministers Hold Talks
LD1706173289 Moscow in Serbo-Croatian to Yugoslavia 1600 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Text] Today Comrade Ivan Silayev, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman, received Comrade Milenko Sarac, deputy federal secretary for the economy of the SFRY, and Comrade Hadzimihajlovic, deputy federal secretary for relations with foreign countries of the SFRY. During the talks, which took place in a business-like and open atmosphere, consideration was given to foreign trade and investment cooperation between the USSR and Yugoslavia, the problems of balancing mutual accounts, and the prospects for production cooperation in the field of engineering in light of the economic reforms now being implemented in both countries.

Serbia's Jevtic Discusses Cooperation With RSFSR
PM1506111389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with D. Jevtic, president of the Executive Council of the Serbian Assembly, by I. Nekrasov: "Broaden the Partnership. Delegation From Yugoslavia Visits Our Country at the Invitation of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers"; date and place not given; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] Desimir Jevtic, president of the Executive Council of the Socialist Republic of Serbia Assembly and head of a delegation from the SFRY, has been visiting our country regularly since 1965. As a designer and, later, as director of an enterprise he has had frequent meetings with his Soviet colleagues. He also came to Moscow while working on his doctorate, and so his good knowledge of the Russian language comes as no surprise.

[Nekrasov] What is the main purpose of your present visit to the Soviet Union?

[Jevtic] Traditional relations of friendship and cooperation have long existed between the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and Serbia. Consequently we need a constant dialogue, when we can discuss plans for further deepening bilateral contacts and exchange opinions on resolving topical problems of political and socioeconomic development in the USSR and the SFRY. The Soviet Union is one of Yugoslavia's main economic partners. However, a certain imbalance has developed recently: Yugoslav exports to the USSR have overtaken imports from your country. We must make joint efforts to overcome this unsatisfactory situation, study the causes, and look for mutually acceptable solutions. Meetings with Soviet colleagues at various levels have persuaded me that this is perfectly feasible. The problem of trade turnover can be successfully resolved in the foreseeable future. Joint Soviet-Yugoslav firms (there are about 10 of these) already in operation are making a considerable contribution to the storehouse of our partnership.

[Nekrasov] You have been to the Soviet Union several times. But you visited Siberia for the first time during your last stay in our country. Could you tell us, please, about the main results of your meetings with Siberians.

[Jevtic] My visit to Tyumen Oblast was a real eye-opener for me. I was particularly struck by the Siberian people: Educated and with new, broad, modern ideas. We were involved in the "Kuban" project in the past. In my opinion, here, in Siberia, an even bigger field of activity is opening up for us and, following on from the "Kuban" project, which has already proved its effectiveness in practice, we can set about drawing up a new Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation project—the "Siberia" project.

Leaders of enterprises in West Siberia evidently have an enormous interest in this kind of partnership with colleagues from the SFRY. Work on plans for confectionery factories in Tyumen and Tobolsk is nearing completion, as well as plans for local timber processing plants. Western Siberia is well known for its oil and gas reserves. That is why we have been looking into the possibility of laying a gas pipeline to Yugoslavia with the help of Soviet specialists. We also have not overlooked questions such as developing direct trade and broadening tourist itineraries. After all, people from our countries must meet more often and be guests in each other's countries.

Medvedev Receives Romanian Party Official
PM1606084989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Soviet-Romanian Relations Developing"]

[Text] On 9 June V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received M. Dobrescu, member of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee Political Executive Committee and chairman of the Central Council of the Romanian General Union of Trade Unions, who passed on a verbal message from N. Ceausescu to M.S. Gorbachev. The conversation, which was held in a warm, friendly atmosphere, touched on some questions of the development of Soviet-Romanian relations in the spirit of the accords reached at top-level meetings.

S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, and I. Bucur, Romanian ambassador to the USSR, took part in the meeting.

West Europe

Observer Comments on Gorbachev Visit to FRG
PM2006144589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA observer Manki Ponomarev article under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Judgments": "Beginning a New Chapter"]

[Text] Events whose genuine significance were not obvious to contemporaries have often occurred in history. Some time was needed to assess the true worth of what had happened. But sometimes the essence of what had been done immediately revealed itself very distinctly, and the passage of time only confirmed the correctness of the first impression.

I think I shall not be mistaken if I say that the visit of M.S. Gorbachev to the FRG, which has just ended, and its results is one of those events whose weight and significance were in no doubt among participants and eyewitnesses. The Soviet side officially assessed them as significant, and the joint statement signed in Bonn as a unique political document.

There is no need to set out the content of this document, just as there is no need to talk in detail about the visit. I can still see close-ups of television reportages from the FRG, and the smell of printers' ink from the newspaper pages carrying the text of the joint statement has still not gone away. But attention should be given to some essential points.

The fact that it took place immediately after the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which determined the basic directions of both the Soviet Union's domestic and foreign policy, left an indelible imprint on the visit's entire progress. It confirmed our adherence to the new political thinking based on the recognition of common human interests and values; of the generally accepted norms of ethics as an indispensable criterion of any policy; of freedom of sociopolitical choice, which excludes interference in the affairs of any state; and of the need to deideologize interstate relations. The visit itself was tangible evidence of our country's readiness and ability not only to proclaim but also to implement these postulates.

We have every reason to assert that relations between the USSR and the FRG are increasingly being built on the principles of the new thinking. It is precisely this which enabled both sides to put an end to the postwar period, to express confidence in the long-term predictability of each other's policy, and the determination to develop their relations in all directions. They stressed that the positive development of their relations is of key importance for the situation in Europe and for relations between East and West as a whole.

Permanent significance attaches to the fact that the Soviet leader's visit to the FRG marked the opening of a new chapter in their relations. What is more, in relations in Europe and the world as a whole. After a long period of political confrontation and the "cold war," which continually threatened to turn into a "hot" one, the long-awaited stage of peaceful development is coming. The search for ways leading to the creation of a Europe of peace and cooperation—a peaceful European structure, a common European home—is being conducted increasingly vigorously.

It is precisely this approach which most accords with the peoples' aspirations and interests. War must no longer be a means of policy, and no one can build their security at the expense of the security of others. The fact that this idea coincides with what ordinary people are thinking was revealed in the genuine demonstrations of support for Soviet restructuring and the new political thinking into which the meetings between the Soviet delegation and FRG citizens spontaneously developed. At the same time this was recognition of the political realism also demonstrated in the Soviet Union's approach to its assessment of the present state of affairs in Europe and in the world as a whole, and of the ideas which it is putting forward and defending in the international arena.

On many occasions the USSR put forward major proposals aimed at reducing the threat of war and at consolidating trust and security. Its initiatives, which are called upon to get rid of the existing imbalances in the Warsaw Pact and NATO armed forces and arms and lead to a reduction in their military potential to stable equilibrium at a lower level sufficient for defense but not for attack, are well known to the entire world. But until now they met only with criticism and suspicion or were declared to be a particularly propagandistic step. I think that for the first time the major Soviet disarmament initiative put forward at the Vienna talks was assessed positively by the West. In particular, the declaration adopted recently in the NATO Council, of which the U.S. President's proposals to reduce forces and arms in Europe formed an integral part, testifies to this.

It is natural that all these problems were subjected to close examination by the participants in the Soviet-West German talks which took place in the center of the European continent, which has ended up as the focus of the most powerful and well-equipped armed forces in the East and the West. The Soviets noted that the spirit of the times was noticeable in the Brussels declaration, and the the U.S. and NATO agreement, expressed for the first time, to embark on reducing their forces in Europe, and their willingness to also reduce their offensive means—earlier they required this only of the Soviet Union—was assessed as a positive factor.

Nonetheless, the old directives and approaches inherited from the period of confrontation can be felt in the NATO document. This relates particularly to the clearly expressed desire to perpetuate the policy of nuclear deterrence, and therefore nuclear war as well. A peaceful order in Europe demands not nuclear deterrence, but containment of nuclear weapons. This is why the joint declaration signed a few days ago in Bonn particularly stresses that the Soviet Union and the FRG advocate a 50-percent reduction in U.S. and Soviet strategic offensive nuclear arms and concerted Soviet-U.S. decisions at the talks on nuclear and space arms, which also concerns the observance of the ABM Treaty.

This statement acquires particular significance as Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms are being resumed tomorrow in Geneva after a prolonged interval connected with the change of administration in Washington's. Despite the fact that the sides agreed the basic parameters of a future agreement as far back as 18 months ago, many difficulties lie ahead. Objective difficulties—the subject of the talks itself is very complex and a great deal in mankind's fortunes depends on their outcome. Judging from press reports, the fact that the U.S. side is embarking on a fresh round of talks either by effectively adhering to its old positions, making it difficult to achieve success, or by failing to define them fully, cannot fail to cause alarm. Even R. Burt, the head of the delegation, was confirmed in this post by the U.S. Senate literally the day before the talks resumed.

Concern is also caused by clear attempts by certain Western circles and the press organs which serve them to distort the sense of the talks between the USSR and the FRG, to declare that their results are almost a deal behind the allies' backs and contrary to the allies' interests and reflect the Soviet Union's desire to drive a wedge between the NATO countries and separate West Germany from the North Atlantic bloc.

In my view, a clear implication lay behind one of the questions put to M.S. Gorbachev at the concluding press conference. Would the Soviet Union prefer, a U.S. journalist asked, that U.S. forces remain in Europe or leave Europe?

Evidently, it did not occur to the questioner that we are concerned with building not a military barracks in Europe, not new weapons arsenals and dumps, but a common home for all Europeans, and also Americans and Canadians, where everyone who lives there would find it convenient, comfortable, and tranquil. As for foreign forces, then the consistent Soviet policy is that in due course they will cease to exist on foreign territory at all.

This time has still not come. There are forces of the past and contradictions inherited from the past. So we still cannot give up the army and do away with weapons. The same can be said for military alliances. As for insinuations aimed at the USSR concerning the results of the talks in Bonn, it was said there quite plainly: The sides' policy takes into account their treaty and allied commitments, it is not aimed against anyone.

Yakovlev Receives Outgoing FRG Ambassador

LD2006234789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today [20 June] Comrade Yakovlev received Meyer-Landrut, FRG ambassador to the USSR, in connection with his forthcoming final departure from Moscow. In the course of a friendly conversation, the results of the recent Soviet-West German summit were discussed from the point of view of the practical implementation of the accords reached.

FRG's Genscher Meets With Israel's Arens

LD1806170889 Hamburg DPA in German 1425 GMT 18 Jun 89

[Excerpts] Bonn (DPA)—Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, during a meeting with his Israeli counterpart Moshe Arens in Bonn on Sunday [18 June], has once again advocated an international Middle East conference. This was announced by the Foreign Ministry after the 3-hour meeting of the two politicians. According to diplomatic circles, Genscher assessed the initiative of Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir for Israeli-Arab negotiations as a "positive step." However, Bonn sees more promising opportunities for a Middle East peace in a Middle East conference, it was said. [passage omitted]

According to the Foreign Ministry, Genscher briefed his colleague about the visit by Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. The exchange of views, characterized as "friendly," also touched on the USSR practice of granting exit visas. [passage omitted]

Further Reportage on Baklanov Activities in Paris

Visit Summarized

PM2006095389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Cooperation Deepening"; for further reportage of the Baklanov Paris visit, see pages 35-36 of the 16 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT]

[Text] Paris, 15 Jun—Opportunities for further deepening dynamic Soviet-French partnership in priority sectors were examined during the visit here by O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He was in this country 11 through 15 June for the 38th international aerospace show held at Le Bourget not far from the French capital.

This major and truly worldwide exhibition of civil and military hardware has become a review of the most advanced achievements by scientists and designers and of those who implement their schemes. For the first time the show presented examples of Soviet military hardware.

The Soviet section has rightly been receiving great attention from visitors, specialists, and the French and foreign press. The unique air transport complex consisting of the "Mriya," the most powerful transporter of our day, and the space shuttle "Buran" won high acclaim. There was a constantly large number of people wanting a more detailed knowledge of the Il-96-300 and Tu-204 airliners. These machines open the way to the skies for a new generation of Soviet airliners which are far more technically sophisticated, comfortable, and economical than their predecessors.

In the aircraft passenger compartments and on the tarmac, O.D. Baklanov held conversations with the creators of advanced aircraft equipment and discussed questions of its further improvement and of increasing competitiveness on the world's passenger and freight routes. It was stressed in particular that there must be greater concern for the amenities provided for passengers on board our aircraft. In this regard there is a need to study in greater depth the experience of the leading foreign aviation firms. The exhibition at Le Bourget provides such an opportunity.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary attended demonstration flights by a number of the machines on show here. During a visit to the pavilion of the "Aviaeksport" all-union foreign trade association its workers talked about the intentions of the representatives of the foreign aircraft building firms and aviation enterprises to study in greater detail the possibility of supplying them with a number of Soviet units, appliances, and composite materials. In the opinion of our experts, this demonstrates that Soviet aircraft building has confidently attained a new level of quality which meets modern requirements.

International collaboration and cooperation on the firm foundation of mutual advantage is one of the main areas for strengthening and further developing this positive trend. During visits to Alcatel, Thomson, and Saft, firms well known for the design and production of high quality aviation and space equipment, a range of questions connected with the possibility of joint work were discussed, in particular work in the formation of a global communications system using Soviet and French equipment. It was noted that this combination is in the interests not only of our countries but also of all mankind.

This theme was continued in Toulouse, where the CPSU Central Committee secretary visited enterprises belonging to the firms Aerospatiale and Matra and the National Center for Space Studies [CNES].

The idea of the need for closer cooperation in those spheres of space technology in which the two countries have gained much valuable experience was expressed with urgency. Here, too, the two national programs have points of contact. Soviet rocket launchers, unequalled in the world in terms of capacity, can perform tasks involving the placing in orbit of payloads for a large number of countries. The commercialization of space is an effective path for multinational cooperation in this sphere and the consolidation of the efforts of states which are partners in the peaceful use of interplanetary space.

The new political thinking makes it possible to attain a new level in economic mutual relations between countries in the solution of the fundamental problems of accelerating world scientific and technical progress. This entire range of questions is being given new importance among business circles in the USSR and France on the eve of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to this country. The world expects substantial movement in this vitally important sphere, and as many concrete steps as possible should be taken now. Soviet-French conversations highlighted in particular the idea that space cooperation is one of the most important areas in improving our planet's environment.

There was a meeting between the CPSU Central Committee secretary and the leadership of the French Communist Party. O.D. Baklanov visited V.I. Lenin's apartment-cum-museum in Marie Rose Street in Paris and honored the memory of the heroes of the Paris Commune at the Pere Lachaise cemetery.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary had a meeting at the USSR embassy in Paris with staffers of Soviet institutions in France, during which O.D. Baklanov gave his impressions of the recently finished Congress of USSR People's Deputies and answered questions.

To coincide with the Le Bourget show, President Mitterrand of France decorated a group of Soviet cosmonauts who had been taking part in a Soviet-French joint flight. O.D. Baklanov took part in the ceremony.

Baklanov Meets French Minister

LD1606135489 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] Paris June 16 TASS—Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Oleg Baklanov and Soviet civil aviation minister Aleksandr Volkov, in France to attend the 38th International Air Show, had a meeting with Michel Delebarre, a French minister in charge of transportation.

The sides noted with satisfaction that Soviet-French cooperation in the sphere of transport was mutually beneficial and was developing along the line of ascent.

They positively assessed the activity of the Soviet airline Aeroflot and Air France aimed at promoting economic, scientific, technical, cultural and tourist relations between the USSR and France.

They discussed ways of deepening cooperation in designing new aircraft, operating international air routes and perfecting the civil aviation infrastructure.

Magazine Discusses Gorbachev July Visit to France

LD1606175689 Moscow TASS in English 1716 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] Paris, June 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Viktor Khrekov:

The popular French magazine "FRANCE-USSR" published by the society of the same name had its revival. The magazine was founded in 1944. The first issue of its new edition was sent to subscribers and put on sale at newsstands today. Not only the magazine's format, but also its contents changed in a considerable degree. This special issue of the magazine is devoted entirely to the forthcoming official visit to France by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to take place early in July.

The issue carries the exclusive poll held by the magazine jointly with the institute for public opinion research, IPSOS. The poll analyzes the attitude of the French people to the Soviet Union. "What do you think of Gorbachev?" is the first question. The absolute majority, 71 per cent of the poll, said that they have a positive opinion of the Soviet leader. Only 8 per cent of the people polled gave a negative assessment (it is characteristic, that just two years ago 56 per cent of a similar poll

gave a positive answer and 19 per cent—negative]. Substantiating their opinion, 27 per cent of the poll said that Mikhail Gorbachev "set the USSR in motion". 24 per cent of the people emphasized that the Soviet leader is "open to the world, accepts a dialogue". 15 per cent said that "he is striving to establish peace, to put an end to the cold war, proposes disarmament".

Among the most important changes that have taken place in the USSR over the past four years, the people polled mentioned the Soviet Union's openness, glasnost, disarmament and nuclear arms reduction.

As to Soviet-French relations, 31 per cent of the poll [words indistinct] is the priority direction, 14 per cent emphasized the need for cooperation in the area of disarmament and consolidation of peace. Among other most important areas of interaction, widening of people-to-people exchange and development of tourism were also mentioned.

There is another interesting question: "What would you tell Gorbachev if you met him in Paris in July?" The most characteristic answers were: "I would welcome his policy and wish him to continue in the same direction". "I would talk to him about disarmament and peace". "I would talk about democracy, greater freedom for everyone". On the whole 72 per cent of French men and women expressed the readiness to give assistance to the Soviet Union in achieving success in perestroyka.

The magazine also carries an interview with French Minister of Foreign Affairs Roland Dumas. Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit will be an event of extreme importance, the French foreign minister said. "Without doubt, it will give a fresh impetus to our relations", he said. Touching upon the changes taking place in the USSR, the minister appraised them positively, noting that the events of the recent days, specifically the entire course of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, attested to constant efforts aimed at the further democratisation of Soviet society. He said France follows with much attention and sympathy the evolution in the USSR and holds that it can have only a positive impact on the strengthening of Franco-Soviet ties.

"We are determined to inspire changes, to develop contacts in every areas", Dumas said. "The fact that state appropriations for the widening of cultural, scientific and technological ties, for the creation of joint ventures doubled over the past two years, vividly confirmed our striving for this," Dumas said. "The deepening of our cooperation to be discussed during meetings between Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand will help build a fairer and more durable peace".

"The items in the new publication of our magazine are our modest contribution to the success of the forthcoming Soviet-French summit", Vladimir Machabelli, deputy general secretary of "France-USSR" Society, told TASS. "We must come to know each other better so that our friendship should strengthen. And friendship presupposes openness, complete trust. This is why we shall continue to work in the spirit of glasnost, and shall be telling the truth about our friends, people in the land of Soviets".

Commentary Criticizes Turkey Over MiG Pilot

LD1706171189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 17 Jun 89

[From the "I Serve the Soviet Union" program, presented by Kim Kukholev]

[Text] [Kukholev] As you know, comrades, on 20 May Air Force pilot Zuyev, removed from flying for health reasons, hijacked a MiG-29 fighter after using a weapon to attack a guard in the aircraft bay and injuring him. The next day, at the request of the Soviet side, the Turkish Government returned the hijacked plane but has so far refused to extradite Zuyev. Here is our commentary. At the microphone is Arkadiy Ivakovich Ter-Okopov, head of a department of criminal law and proceedings at the Red Banner Military Institute, doctor of juridicial sciences, and colonel of jurisprudence.

[Ter-Okopov] The Soviet Government demands for Zuyev's extradition are well-founded. There are a number of international agreements requiring the state either to take measures to extradite a criminal or to condemn him in line with existing legislation. Zuyev has committed several crimes which are grave: first, desertion. In addition, Zuyev has committed the grave crime of forcing a soldier to violate his duties.

What is more grave is the crime of hijacking an aircraft. There are reasons to charge him with other crimes, too; for example, with illegally crossing the border. According to international agreements, Zuyev must at least be held criminally responsible for hijacking the aircraft. You know that there are laws declaring that hijacking of a plane is an international crime. Any state detaining a hijacker must either return the hijacker or condemn him in line with the law. The Turkish side tries to justify Zuyev's actions by claiming that they were committed for political motives. In reply to this, I would like to say that committing a crime for political motives does not rule out criminal responsibility. Whatever the motives for committing a crime, they do not justify a crime, much less a military crime. It is surprising that the Turkish side has made a decision like this despite the fact that the competent Soviet bodies have submitted all the necessary documents which contain sufficient facts regarding Zuyev's commission of the crime. We are hopeful and confident that Zuyev will receive the appropriate punishment either by the Soviet or Turkish court.

Austrian Antitank Missile Decision 'Out of Step'
PM2006105889 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent S. Tosunyan report: "Out of Step With the Times"]

[Text] Vienna—The Austrian State Defense Council has adopted a decision to buy the "Bill" missile system from Sweden. The missiles are intended for use against tanks.

Before making their choice, since last fall Austrian military specialists have carried out test firing on a special range. Apart from the Swedish system, "Milan II" missiles, of Franco-West German manufacture, were also tested.

More than 1 billion schillings will be spent on the purchase. Robert Lichal, minister for national defense, told journalists that 15 June, the day on which the decision was taken, was a festive day for him. But the Austrian public does not share the minister's delight. People are perplexed as to why neutral Austria has to arm itself with missiles at precisely this time, when a process of detente and disarmament is taking shape throughout the world. What is the need? After all, no one threatens the Alpine republic from either West or East. Furthermore a meeting of representatives of the CSCE states recently ended successfully in its capital, where questions of lowering the levels of conventional arms as far as possible are now being discussed. And all at once neutral Austria is itself making a move that is out of step with the times.

The "Young Recruits"—the socialist party's youth organization, the "Green" parties, and women's organizations have protested the arming of the Austrian Army with missiles.

A statement by Franz Muhri, chairman of the Communist Party of Austria [KPOe], published in the newspaper VOLKSTIMME, says that the KPOe resolutely rejects plans to purchase missiles of any kind. At a time when representatives of Western and Eastern countries are engaged in serious discussions on disarmament in Vienna, the statement notes, in our country people are trying to push through a plan to arm the Army with missiles. And that is contrary to the State Treaty, which forbids Austria to equip its Army with missile weapons.

A commentator in the newspaper ARBEITERZEITUNG observes, not without irony: "In Moscow, Washington, and Bonn politicians are racking their brains over how to achieve disarmament. And our defense minister wants to arm us. Austrians were getting along fine without the 'Bills,' and they have no use at all for these missiles now."

Preparations Begin for Soviet-Austrian Space Flight
LD1906141289 Moscow TASS in English 1334 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—Working groups of the USSR and Austria have started preparations for a joint manned space flight. They completed discussing the scientific programme of joint research and experiments to be carried out during the joint flight, scheduled for mid-1991. As a TASS correspondent was told in the glavkosmos (the chief department for the development and utilization of space equipment for national economy and research) of the USSR, the flight will be made on a commercial basis.

In the meantime Austria is busy selecting candidates for the international crew, there being women among them.

Economists have calculated that, ordinarily, an eight-days flight of a foreign cosmonaut costs over ten million dollars. The cost includes training and the researcher-cosmonaut's stay on the Soviet long-duration orbital station, including the blast off and flight in the space vehicle. In this case the cost may be somewhat lower if the Austrian side comes up with and implements in orbit an interesting programme of scientific experiments which it is working out at present.

The first space apparatus launched in the USSR on a commercial basis was the Indian satellite "IRS-1A". It was inserted in orbit by a Soviet Vostok booster on March 17, 1988.

The more than thirty years' experience gained in the development of cosmonautics now enables the Soviet Union to engage in mutually advantageous commercial activity in near-earth orbits. It encompasses, among other things, information on particular regions' resources, production of materials in zero gravity and deep void, inserting space equipment in orbit, making satellite communications channels available to users, the use of onboard subsystems of orbital stations and of automatic satellites for scientific research on behalf of a particular state.

Major USSR Order From Austrian Company Reported
AU1606142089 Vienna DER STANDARD in German 16 Jun 89 p 16

["HA" report: "AMAG Company Receives Major USSR Order"]

[Excerpt] Vienna—The state-owned Austrian Metal Works (AMAG) aluminium corporation has received a Soviet order valued at 1.3 billion schillings to supply a "human centrifuge," a medical-technical testing apparatus for jet pilots and astronauts. [passage omitted]

Italian KGB Recruit Sentenced to Prison

AU1606201089 Rome ANSA in English 1043 GMT 16 Jun 89

[Text] (ANSA)—Trieste, June 16—An electronics technician from Trieste, Giorgio Stancic, arrested last February in possession of military secrets, was sentenced Thursday [15 June] by a Trieste court to nine years' imprisonment for political and military espionage, conspiracy and divulging the contents of secret papers.

The military secrets found on Stancic concerned the technical memory of a military surveillance system the Italian Ministry of Defence had commissioned from the meteor company of Ronchi Dei Legionari, near Gorizia, where the technician worked.

Stancic, according to the prosecution, was paid around fifteen thousand dollars by two KGB agents, Vitalj Alexandrovic Popov and Nikolai Kirikkovich Smetankin [spellings of names as received], to get hold of top-secret information about the project.

International warrants have been issued for the arrest of the two KGB men, who are still in hiding.

Primakov, Others Attend UK Embassy Reception

PM1906113989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] R. Braithwaite, British ambassador to the USSR, held a reception 15 June to mark a national holiday.

The reception was attended by Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union, USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.M. Nikiforov, and other officials.

Swedish Ambassador Presents Credentials to Lukyanov

PM2106102389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Presentation of Credentials"]

[Text] Orjan Berner, Swedish ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, presented his credentials in the Kremlin 19 June to A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

Sweden pursues a consistent policy of neutrality and strives for good, stable, and friendly relations with the Soviet Union, O. Berner said. Stressing that relations between the two countries have improved considerably in recent years, he expressed the opinion that restructuring and glasnost will open up new paths to cooperation and contacts. The ambassador noted the profound interest with which Swedish people are following the renewal process in the Soviet Union and familiarizing themselves with the results of the recent Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Accepting the credentials on behalf of the Presidium and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, A.I. Lukyanov stated that Sweden's active, peace-loving, and constructive policy of neutrality and the development and strengthening of good-neighborly Soviet-Swedish relations are a substantive factor for peace and stability on the European continent. It was stressed that the well-known Murmansk initiatives by the Soviet leadership formulated specific proposals aimed at deepening detente in northern Europe. They have one aim—to turn the north, where the USSR and Sweden are neighbors—into a region of genuine trust and active peaceful cooperation.

The ambassador was briefed on the profound changes taking place in all spheres of Soviet society's life—changes which were convincingly reaffirmed in the results of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Both sides expressed the hope that under present-day conditions additional new channels will open up for expanding cooperation between the USSR and Sweden in the trade, economic, scientific, cultural, and other spheres.

After the presentation of credentials and an exchange of speeches A.I. Lukyanov and O. Berner had a friendly talk.

Soviet Commentator Views Greek Election Results

NC1906164489 Athens Domestic Service in Greek 1130 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] We contacted Vladimir Korolev, head of the world affairs department of the NOVOSTI press agency and former director of the NOVOSTI bureau in Athens for many years, for his views on the parliamentary elections in Greece:

[Begin Korolev recording in Russian with superimposed Greek translation] I think it is very important to comment on the results of the Greek eletions, which I followed very closely, because after the USSR, Greece is the country I worked in for the longest time. I followed the 1981 elections in Greece and those in 1985, when the Panhellenic Socialist Movement [PASOK] won a decisive victory. I believe that in this election, the political platforms did not fail because the political platforms of the main parties aimed at securing votes.

In my opinion, this time the winners are the people, who wanted to demonstrate their disapproval of PASOK's policy and get new people in power. To a great extent, PASOK lost strength because of the political and economic scandals that shook the country's political life recently. I believe these scandals were responsible for most of the votes PASOK lost.

In my opinion, we must not regard the results of the elections as victory for New Democracy [ND], because, despite everything, the right-wing conservative forces did not win; the left-wing progressive forces were the final winners. The combined forces of the left-wing Coalition for Progress secured a majority in parliament. The success of the ND indicates that PASOK, during its past two 4-year terms in power, was unable to implement its promises to the people, who after all, brought it to power. This is, of course, a serious lesson for the future. All progressive forces must know that apart from their political platform they must also think about the possibilities for implementing their platform when heading for elections.

At this time we must also take into account that there has been a discernible rise in Greeks' political conscience, which is now more characteristic of the Greeks than other Europeans.

What will happen in the future? We, here in Moscow, can only make some predictions. Will the left-wing forces be able to form a government? In my opinion, this will depend on whether there are common points between the political platforms of the left-wing, progressive coalition, and PASOK. There is some common ground on the political and economic levels. In my opinion, the possibilities of ND forming a government are slim. Although the results are not final, ND will find it very difficult to secure the five seats it needs as things now stand. We must also take into account that independent centrist forces, which could have strengthened ND's power, do not exist. My final appraisal will be made after any possible readjustments are made. Over the last few years, PASOK has lost its influence on those classes that shape public opinion. The struggle between the progressive and conservative forces remains the main characteristic of the Greek political scene. [end recording]

USSR Economist Interviewed on Trade With EC

AU1906080289 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 19 Jun 89 p 2

[Interview with Soviet economist Vladimir Kvint, "close associate of restructuring theoretician Abel Aganbegyan and member of the Academy of Sciences," by Otmar Lahodynsky: "Buying Consumer Goods With Gold Reserves"; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] [Lahodynsky] The EC Council has just agreed to a very broad negotiation mandate for a trade and cooperation agreement with the Soviet Union. What do you expect of the EC?

[Kvint] One year after the signing of the agreement between the EC and CEMA this is the next logical step. The closer the USSR's relations with Western Europe are, the more secure peace will be. We need high-quality technology, but also consumer goods and foodstuffs. Here in Western Europe there is mass consumption. We, on the other hand, have enormous reserves of natural resources and raw materials. One effect of mutual integration will be joint ventures, of which we have 520 at present. Soon we will establish the first "free zones," probably one in the Far East in Nakhodka near Vladivostok, another zone in Vyborg at the Finnish border and one in Novgorod.

[Lahodynsky] Will there be a legal guarantee for Western investments, like in Hungary?

[Kvint] So far we have concluded such agreements with 16 countries, such as Belgium, Finland, and the FRG. However, there should be uniform legal regulations on this topic.

[Lahodynsky] In Cologne Mr Gorbachev warned against a "technological division of Europe," because Western high technology is often banned from exports for military reasons.

[Kvint] The list of the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls also has a detrimental effect for the West. In the United States alone 158,000 jobs were lost because of it. The current trade between the Soviet Union and the Western countries is far too low. In 1980 CEMA trade with the EC amounted to only 1.48 percent of the entire international trade volume. Last year this proportion declined to 1.16 percent.

[Lahodynsky] Gorbachev said that his countries is competitive with the West in several economic sectors. Which ones did he mean?

[Kvint] The developing countries are buying three times more machines from us than the EC. In the steel sector our technology reaches top world standards: 90 percent of Japan's steel casting enterprises use our production processes.

The performances of our applied sciences are larger than those of our industry.

[Lahodynsky] What are the main problems in trade with the West?

[Kvint] We have to make the ruble convertible. We also need free export of profits and better conditions for joint ventures. Of course, the price reform, which is to be in effect as of 1991, is important for our domestic market. In this connection, it is important not to reduce the standard of living of our citizens. Unfortunately, often this has nothing to do with socialism any more.

[Lahodynsky] In the Soviet Union many people think that supplies were better under Brezhnev.

[Kvint] This is correct. But we have destroyed the old mechanism while the new one is still under development. It is like the renovation of a house. During the renovation life is not quite as comfortable as before or afterwards.

[Lahodynsky] But when will the average Soviet citizen be able to live more comfortably?

[Kvint] Perestroyka is a long-term process. We have an enormous country. It is like a long train: It brakes slowly but it also accelerates slowly. We will see the first results in 2 years. Perestroyka as a whole will be more or less concluded in the year 2000. The most radical steps are being taken now, even though we can move on only gradually.

[Lahodynsky] In the debate in the Supreme Soviet economics professor Shmelov proposed raising Western loans to import needed consumer goods. Is this a good idea?

[Kvint] Tactically it is completely okay, because during the period of perestroyka the standard of living should not decline. It is high time to sell part of our gold reserves, which the people in our country have earned through their work. This year we will spend 19.5 percent less on armaments. The money that is saved in this way should also be spent on consumer goods and foodstuffs.

[Lahodynsky] Could the nationality conflicts, like the one in Uzbekistan, endanger the reforms?

[Kvint] There is a dialectic link between politics and economics. If political changes are far ahead of economic ones, there are problems. If political reforms lag behind economic ones, there are problems, too, as you can see in China just now. The nationality problem is floating on the surface because of glasnost, whose greatest enemy it is at the same time. It can be used against the people who are carrying out the reforms. This is very dangerous.

Future Scientific Cooperation With EC Viewed

PM1606104289 Madrid DIARIO 16 in Spanish 14 Jun 89 p 4 (science supplement)

[Article by Yuriy Karpenko, aide at State Committee for Science and Technology: "Scientific Cooperation Between EC and USSR"]

[Text] In the changes currently being carried out in the USSR much importance is attached to technical and scientific progress.

In view of the activation of processes of integration in Western Europe, especially in the scientific and technical sphere and within the EC framework, it is clear that East-West relations are acquiring a more concrete character in this field.

The statement on the establishment of official relations between CEMA and the EC and the establishment of the official relations between the USSR and the EC have created the conditions for stepping up cooperation.

Comparing the priorities indicated in the plans for scientific and technical cooperation being carried out within the EC framework, in CEMA's comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress, and in the USSR's national plans for science and technology, a similarity can be seen between the principal approaches, due to the global character of the revolutionary changes occurring in the field relating to obtaining new basic industrial technologies.

Therefore in the work on formulating a contractual basis and specifically on drafting and signing a broad agreement on trade and cooperation between the USSR and the EC considerable space has been devoted to the organization of cooperation in science and technology.

For instance, cooperation could take place in the following fields: environmental protection, biotechnology, electronics, new production and processing materials and technologies, complete automation, ecologically clean industrial production methods, and transport, among others.

Cooperation between the USSR and the EC could take various forms: formulating regulations for the exchange of documentation and information relating to science and technology; professional training and advanced training of scientific personnel; cooperation in the field of licenses in science and production; the forecasting of technological and scientific development; and cooperation within respective regional and international organizations.

In the exchange of scientific and technical information the key objective could be to create optimal conditions for establishing closer contacts in the economic, scientific, and technological fields. Joint studies could analyze the possibility of organizing joint laboratories and centers working according to specific agreements. The licenses aspect could embrace commercial and noncommercial exchanges of scientific and technological information, while in the science and production fields there could be cooperation on creating developments and putting them into practice.

In general cooperation between the USSR and the EC in this sphere could be based on the experience of cooperation between this country on the one hand and West European national organizations, firms, and companies on the other.Cooperation on the part of Soviet scientific and research organizations whose activities lie within the context of EC programs will, apart from the commercial aspect, also have an intellectual aspect (ideas and technology) and a material aspect (the use of laboratories and equipment).

A contribution to cooperation between the USSR and the EC will be made by Council of Europe initiatives relating to the Soviet Union's involvement in environmental and high-definition television projects and by contacts with the EC in connection with the use of new materials and the invitation for the USSR to join an intergovernmental agreement on preparations for, protection against, and organization of aid during major natural and technological disasters.

Political & Social

Supreme Soviet Committees, Commissions Meet 19-20 Jun

Hearings on New Government Open

LD1906101389 Moscow TASS in English 1002 GMT 19 Jun 89

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—The Supreme Soviet's committees and the commissions of its two chambers today open hearings on a new Soviet government proposed to the full-time parliament by Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov on June 10.

The hearings follow a break which gave MP's [members of parliament] some rest after the inaugural Congress of People's Deputies and the first parliamentary sittings.

The hearings are expected to last at least a week, marking a new addition to Soviet parliamentary practice.

The previous Supreme Soviet used to endorse any cabinet suggested by the head of government without any debate by a unanimous show of hands.

By contrast, following the attentive and shrewd Supreme Soviet scrutiny of Premier Ryzhkov, each of his 13 deputies and more than 50 ministers are now to go through the same "parliamentary purgatory" as well.

And all indications are that some of them will find the going pretty rough.

Like everyone else, the law-makers can't escape the influence of the press (this new-found influence of the media on the deputy corps is another new aspect of Soviet political life) and the newspaper IZVESTIYA, for example, ran a lengthy article last week, criticising Gennadiy Bogomyakov, nominee for minister of the oil and gas industries.

The paper claimed that as party leader in the Tyumen region, which is the main Siberian oil production site, he pandered to the rapacious exploitation of the area's natural riches.

On the whole, however, everybody agrees that the new government selected by Ryzhkov promises to be the most competent in Soviet history.

Suffice it to say that it includes six full or corresponding members of the Academy of Sciences and over 20 others with scientific degrees.

On top of this, with an average age of 55, the proposed cabinet is much younger than its predecessor.

Naturally enough, this is largely due to the infusion of a lot of fresh blood. Of the 100-strong government formed in 1984, only ten cabinet members are suggested for the new Council of Ministers.

Candidates for a number of key posts are people who were made ministers during the time of perestroika. They include, for instance, Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Konstantin Katushev, Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov, Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin and KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov.

Elections of Deputy Chairmen on Agenda

LD1906195289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 19 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] People's deputies who have become members of the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and of the standing commissions of its chambers today assembled for the first time within the framework of the working bodies formed by the session. Sittings of most of the committees and commissions have opened in the rooms of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin. The elections of deputy chairmen and secretaries of the working bodies, discussion of their status, and exchanges of views on priority tasks for the immediate future are on the agenda.

Members of the committees and commissions familiarized themselves with the biographies of the nominees, whose inclusion in the Soviet Government is proposed, in their fields of activity. Over the next few days, the deputies are to pass judgments on these nominees and submit these judgements for discussion at a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Ryzhkov Presents Candidates 20 Jun

LD2006165389 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov today presented his choice of candidates to the posts of his deputies, defence minister and chairman of the State Security Committee of the USSR to the commissions of the two houses and the committees of the nation's working parliament, the Supreme Soviet.

The deputies thoroughly considered the proposals, heard and discussed the candidacies, and worked out their conclusions that will be submitted for consideration to the Supreme Soviet.

They also considered candidacies to the Supreme Court.

The work of the commissions and committees is continuing.

Ryzhkov Interviewed on Candidacies

LD2106090989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] In the commissions of the chambers and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet, discussion of the new composition of our country's government began today. Our correspondent was granted an interview by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov [chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers]:

[Begin recording] [Ryzhkov] Today, the Supreme Soviet commissions and committees gave consideration to four deputies nominated for deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers. Three of the candidates were Comrade Silayev, Comrade Ryabev, and Comrade Gusev. Their nomination was examined before lunch at the session of certain commissions which are in charge of those fields which our candidates deal with. And after lunch, we examined the nomination of Comrade Biryukova.

[Correspondent] [words indistinct]

[Ryzhkov] What can I say? My first impression—I would not formulate it in such a way that things are not being perceived. I must say that there was very lively, very active discussion. But very many questions are being asked. I understand that these problems have accumulated. Every deputy behaves in a very active way. On the one hand, he tries to learn the program of actions of the future...that is, the person aspiring to the post. On the other hand, he tries to resolve some kind of questions of his own which are of concern to him. Therefore, this is as they say the first day of a stage in our parliamentary life, because nothing like it has ever occurred before. You know...

[Correspondent] Nikolay Ivanovich, is that pleasant or unpleasant?

[Ryzhkov] Well, I think it is necessary. As for being especially pleasant for the candidates to stand around for a couple of hours, to answer questions, rather awkward ones, and so on, I do not think that it is much fun for them. But it is something that needs to be done. Once we change over to these principles whereby a candidate for executive power must, as they say, undergo this examination, when deputies have to hear him and he has to tell them his program then I think that is something that needs to be done.

But what will we be paying attention to? Of course, everyone understands that each aspirant, or more correctly, each candidate, is not able to reply to absolutely all questions because many questions are particular ones. There are very many particular questions. But I think that these four candidates today were recommended for confirmation by the USSR Supreme Soviet because they showed us their erudition. They showed a profound knowledge of the matters they deal with. In my view that is the impression I got when I observed the reactions of the deputies who took an active part. They have seen that these are competent people. [end recording]

Biryukova Proposed Deputy Chairman

LD2006225289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Excerpts] [Announcer Yuriy Korotkov] As we have already reported, commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet began work today. Concrete candidatures of members of the Soviet Government are being considered. I have invited into the studio our commentator Aleksandr Ruvinskiy and I ask him to talk about that meeting.

[Ruvinskiy] In the sessions hall of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, commissions on consumer goods, trade, communal everyday and other services to the population; the commission on questions of work, prices and social policy—these are commissions of the chambers; and committees of the Supreme Soviet on questions of the work of soviets of people's deputies; the development of management and self-management; the committee on agrarian matters, on foodstuffs; and the committee on questions of economic reform, are working jointly today. The candidatures of deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers were submitted for discussion.

[Korotkov] And who, precisely?

[Ruvinskiy] Well, the session was opened by Deputy Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. And he, in accordance with the Consitution, offered the floor to Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. The thing is that these candidatures are submitted by the chairman of the Council of Ministers. And the chairman of our government reported that the candidature of Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova is proposed for the post of deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the Bureau on Social Development, and he gave her biography. She was educated as an engineer-technologist. She worked for a long time in the textile industry and she worked as chief engineer at the (?Trekhgornaya Manufaktura), our well-known combine. She was involved in trade union work in senior posts at the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions]. At the present time she is a candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee.

And Comrade Ryzhkov also talked about the functions in the government of the Bureau on Social Development. This is a permanent body and it coordinates matters connected with the production of consumer goods. And I recall that in the new structure, the proposed structure of the Council of Ministers, it has been proposed to liquidate the Ministry of the Light Industry, while at the USSR Gosplan, a corresponding state committee is being created, but with somewhat different functions.

[passage omitted the Bureau will handle services to the population, trade, health, culture, education and sport matters. Deputies asked Ryzhkov questions about the Biruykova candidature and about the functions of the said Bureau. Biryukova delivered a report about the work of the Bureau; no details given]

Then the deputies, during the course of an hour, even longer, asked her the most diverse questions. [passage omitted: Korotkov asks what kind of questions are submitted to Bibyukova. Ruvinskiy gives examples: the relation of deputies to the principle of allocation of trade resources between town and country; the development of the material base of health care; the question of the existence of the fourth main administration of the health ministry; reasons for nonfulfillment of plans by light industry enterprises; how Biryukova envisages tackling unemployment in Central Asia, here views on women's issues; questions about price rises on consumer goods. A number of deputies delivered speeches on the subject of her candidature, noting the need for all to learn to debate]

[Ruvinskiy] Voting took place on the results of the discussion. A decision was adopted by a majority of votes to recommend that the USSR Supreme Soviet confirm Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Bureau on Social development.

Now at the session, following a break, work is once more continuing. And I should also say that in the first half of the day other candidatures were also considered in the committees and standing commissions of the Supreme Soviet, for the posts of deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers. This was also a sort of preliminary review.

At a joint session of commissions of the Soviet of the Union on questions of industry, power engineering, engineering and technology, and the committees of the Supreme Soviet on questions of economic reform, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov presented comrades Silayev, Rabov and Gusev to the deputies. And also today, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov presented to the deputies the candidatures for the posts of USSR minister of defense—Comrade Yazov; and chairman of the USSR's KGB—Comrade Kryuchkov. And during the course of discussion, the deputies profoundly, thoroughly and critically discussed the candidatures which had been put forward and worked out their remarks on them, which will subsequently be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Proposed Social Development Head

LD2006194689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] And now here is a report by our special correspondents on today's work in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Correspondent] The deputies are debating not only the candidacy of the deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers but also the leaders of the bureaus covering many sectors of our industry or trends of activity both in the production, consumer and services spheres, for example, the Bureau for Social Development. The candidacy of Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova was put forward for this post. She has been heading that area over the past year. The Bureau for Social Development has under its authority the coordination of actions of the light industry, the services sphere, the production of consumer goods and also commerce, health care, education, culture and sports. A huge complex, and there is not a single bit of this area where the deputies—just like all the rest of us—could note over recent years even relative well-being. The detailed and critical discussion lasted for 2 hours. And the commission, after listening to Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova's platform, decided to support her candidacy. [Video shows correspondent speaking to camera; Biryukova addressing deputies; vote]

[Begin recording] [Biryukova] It was a very serious test, a test of my ability either to head this section or not to head it. And I am grateful to the people's deputies who by an overwhelming majority of votes supported my candidacy for this post. And now, after they have supported me, and if I am confirmed by the USSR Supreme Soviet, the most important thing for me is to justify that trust. And even more importantly, our people should in the near future feel changes in the social sphere.

[Correspondent] But they supported your program in doing this, I hope.

[Biryukova] Well, this is extremely pleasant for me, that the program set out by the Bureau for Social Development has been supported literally by every deputy who spoke here.

[Correspondent] Tell me, there were some replies of yours which you are just recalling, in which one senses that you were not satisfied with them?

[Biryukova] Yes. Yes, I feel that on a number of questions I could have replied better, but obviously I was hindered by a certain excitement and purely, well, so to speak, female emotionalism which I have in my nature. [end recording]

[Correspondent] Tomorrow the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet committee and of the commissions of both its chambers continues.

Ryzhkov Interviewed on New Government

LD2006203689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1748 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Interview with Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov following the discussions on the appointment of deputies held by the Supreme Soviet Commissions on 20 June in Moscow; correspondent not identified—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Well, now, an extraordinarily important stage in the Supreme Soviet's work, the confirmation of the government, has begun. How many of the old ministers will be leaving?

[Ryzhkov] If you take the government which was formed in 1984 and functioned during this period, 10 percent have remained, 10 percent. But in the new government which we are now proposing, we are proposing the renewal of half of the people who have been working in recent years—we are submitting a proposal that half of those appointed should be new comrades.

[Correspondent] Nikolay Ivanovich, you, as chairman of the Council of Ministers, must be sad to be parting company with some of them.

[Ryzhkov] The fact is that some greater proportion of the people, the ministers, left at the start of restructuring, as they say, in 1986 and 1987. Those were people who, well, had worked in their time and under their conditions; but when the new economic reform began and new approaches started up in the economy, they realized, for the greater part, that their tempering was of a completely different sort, you see. And many of them came straight to me and said: You know, thank you, but we simply cannot adapt to working under the conditions which you are now proposing to us. They were that detachment.

[Correspondent] Those whose time had passed?

[Ryzhkov] Yes.

[Correspondent] And now many of those who were appointed very recently are also leaving, aren't they?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, a number of comrades who were appointed 2 to 3 years are also leaving now. Some comrades...[Ryzhkov hesitates] I think that we are parting with some of them....

[Correspondent] Without sadness?

[Ryzhkov] Without particular sadness. But there are also people, specialists and managers, who are, in my view, very capable, and they, of course, must not under any circumstances be cast aside. They must be found work. In other words, they must be presented with the opportunity to benefit the state. They still have a fairly large potential.

[Correspondent] Why is it, then, that they are not on the list to be endorsed, the list that is here?

[Ryzhkov] This is because we are sharply reducing the ministries. We are eliminating 25 ministries and committees. This, after all, represents 25 percent. That is why we are willy-nilly selecting for the remaining ministries the very best people—but then there is, after all, a certain thrust, a certain knowledge, a certain thrust and experience of work, and that is why not everything is mutually interchangeable here.

[Correspondent] There are still quite a few days ahead of us, during which ministers will be confirmed or will not be confirmed. Please tell us, though, what principles you were guided by when you were forming the Council of Ministers as such? After all, it is, in principle, people who decide on everything, and they are the main factor—it is not even the structure that is the main thing, but the person in the post, in the armchair.

[Ryzhkov] We have long since been preparing for this day. One cannot say that literally a couple of days before the congress we formulated our position with regard to some people or other, because the work on the new management structure of the national economy at the present stage of the development of the economy—and I emphasize, precisely at the present stage—this work had begun a long time ago, of course, approximately 1 year ago. We went through all the stages; there were very many debates, many discussions. Finally we arrived at this precise structure which we have now forwarded to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

From the point of view of specific candidacies there was, of course, a thorough selection process. We also had many debates. I must say we debated in a democratic way. You have evidently noticed that one half of the Council of Ministers Presidium is not being recommended to occupy the posts they used to occupy. Out of these, the minister of finance is not being recommended; the administrator is not being recommended; and a number of Council of Ministers deputies [as heard], who are still working at present, working during their final days, are not being recommended—but none of this was done in secret; we would sit at a table together with them and we would speak to one another honestly—I mean which one of us can work, which one ought to remain and who should, as they say, give way now to another person. Let me say that it was a very healthy atmosphere, and we had our say, in a comradely way, and we simply had consultations about who is capable of leading the government further. And many comrades said outright: I can work no longer, and let us have this person, let us recommend him. That is why I am, to some extent, satisfied, with this, shall we say, democratic approach toward the forming of, above all, the presidium—and let us take into account the fact that these people have done a very great deal, and that is why we are working together with them up until the very last minute. They are at work right now, too. We often gather together and discuss matters, even though they know that in a week's time they will no longer be, say, presidium members.

As regards the ministers, well, there were also long discussions with ministries and other specialists. We consulted both enterprises and local bodies and republics. In other words, we had very large-scale consultations. I understand that, generally speaking, some candidate may fail somewhere; I do not exclude such a possibility. But we will go on; we will argue that we nominate a good candidate, and if we are persuaded that this candidate is not suitable, then the government will take the corresponding decision and think who else could be proposed for the post.

[Correspondent] And the last question. Nilolay Ivanovich, very many economists, both provincial, at lower levels, and simply ordinary people, are saying now that the old has been partly destroyed but the new has not been partly built. What do you think such great restructuring within the Council of Ministers, within its structure, and the appointment of new people will promote, so to speak—quickly joining a normal channel of the economy or, rather, slowing it down?

[Ryzhkov] I think that the structure of managing the national economy which we have put forward now is optimal at this stage of development. For there are two points of view. One point of view implies...[Ryzhkov changes thought] It is based on the idea that in this case, too, there are too many ministries, very many. Others say that, on the contrary, more ministries are required, otherwise we will lose the strings of management in the national economy. I think that both things are dangerous, generaly speaking. If we do not do anything from the point of view of reducing the bodies for running the national economy, we will be unavoidably putting fetters on the initiative of the primary link, that is, enterprises, organizations, and so on. Willy-nilly, the managerial bodies will be carrying out leadership all the same, you see. If we remove, say, managerial bodies today, and leave a very small number of functional ones, I think that we are not ready yet in the primary link, regarding horizontal ties or direct economic relations—they are not fully ready in our country. We are at the crossroads now, at a very complex stage.

That is why I think that, well, this is the best possible option for this 5-year plan period. As for the next, the subsequent quinquennium, it will be the future government that will deal with this. If the economic reform proceeds in the direction we hope for—and we believe that it should proceed precisely in this direction, and under no circumstances can a respite be permitted here—there will, in my view, be even fewer ministries. But his will be the next stage.

So, I am a supporter of a stage by stage approach with respect both to the development of the economy and, correspondingly, the management bodies in our country. This, in my view, is currently the best possible option, although you can hear proposals to this effect: Let us have more; we will set up a committee, we will set up a ministry, why are you amalgamating us—other people say things that are diametrically opposed.

[Correspondent] In all likelihood, all these views revolve round a single core: How are the plan and the market to be combined?

[Ryzhkov] But of course. The point is that we should form the market. After all, this is what we say—that generally we support a socialist market, we support this. But it is in the process of being formed; it is still, I mean we have not yet become accustomed to it. Even today you have just heard comrades speaking, saying why is it that production of consumer goods is only allowed to be measured in millions, while, as they say, there is no abundance at all? But if abundance is to be preplanned, if every button is to be a position within the plan and so on, what sort of a market is this, then? Indeed, rubles are allocated, but subsequently there ought to be a dialogue with the trade sector. Let there be talks with the trade sector about what it requires—this is the process whereby the market is formed. But the market ought to be controlled.

When a process takes place whereby the socialist market is gradually formed, when wholesale trade comes into being, then there will, of course, be a need for many fewer management bodies. So there is now, indeed, this combination of the market and the planning—these are two corresponding vessels. And they ought all the time to....

[Correspondent, interrupting] But can it not be the case that they are mutually exclusive?

[Ryzhkov] No, I think I think that the market will develop further and the plan principles will assume an ever-decreasing role. But in our socialist market the planning regulations ought to be there—but not the kind of planning we got used to, for these are completely different things. We should regulate processes, the economic processes—this is what our planning principle ought to consist of and not, as used to be the case before that, when everything had to be accounted for in the plans.

[Correspondent] 22,000,000 items?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, 22,000,000. Is it really something realistic indeed?

[Correspondent] Thank you, Nikolay Ivanovich, we wish you success.

[Ryzhkov] Thank you, too.

Yeltsin Interviewed on Supreme Soviet Position

LD2006211489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Interview with Boris Yeltsin, USSR people's deputy and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Construction and Architecture, by commentator Dmitriy Kiselev; from the "Vremya" newscast, under the "USSR Supreme Soviet Who's Who" feature; date, place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Kiselev] During the election campaign you suggested reducing state expenditures on capital construction by one-third. Are you of the same opinion? And will you defend your point of view, making use of your new powers? [Video shows a picture of Yeltsin, followed by interview with the commentator Dmitriy Kiselev]

[Yeltsin] I think that it is precisely the questions of investment policy and the very large list of this policy in the direction of the social sphere—not by 5-8-10 percent moreover, but by 30-40 percent—that makes it possible to cut precisely capital investments in industrial construction, and, by this, furnish an increase for social needs. I am convinced of this since that will resolve a number of questions, not only social matters. It will resolve questions of building materials. It will resolve the question of balance of the builders' plans which forever suffer due to the fact that there is no balance.

[Kiselev] Is that having an effect on the state deficit? You see, that is practically task No 1 at the present time in our financial policy.

[Yeltsin] The fact that money is released naturally has an effect. I am even in favor of the money that is being cut, let's say at the expense of industrial construction, being taken out of circulation and to thereby strengthen the ruble.

[Kiselev] So you want to say that in your committee, figuratively speaking, there is a button that can be pushed to switch off the money printing machines printing the inflation money?

[Yeltsin] Well, a sufficiently large part of that button.

[Kiselev] Here there are contradictions between the economic and social costs. You see, in reducing investments in capital construction, we are thereby, as it were, cutting the number of jobs.

[Yeltsin] As far as the builders are concerned, there is no threat, because today there is a very great shortage of precisely such workers to implement the program. And taking into account that this proposal is not estimated for 20 years, but for 5-7 years, there is no threat.

[Kiselev] Boris Nikolayevich, finally what do you intend to undertake during the first 100 days in your new post.

[Yeltsin] The first thing is to sort out the cadres in the cabinet of the Council of Ministers, to examine at the cabinet and at the committee what Comrade Ryzhkov proposed. The second thing is to reveal each person, what he has brought to the committee with him, what thoughts, what ideas, what suggestions. The third thing is to precisely formulate the conception of investment policy, precisely policy and convince everyone that this is not just some kind of distribution committee, not a management body. This is a body of the country's supreme legislative power, legislative and exercising control. Therefore, on no account should they replace the bodies let's say, of the USSR Council of Ministers. And Comrade Ryzhkov and the Council of Ministers should not think that in the person of the committee he has found a very good direct assistant that will draw up documents for him. No. The committee will propose to the Council of Ministers some, its own ideas, or say, points of view, its suggestions. After that, the Council of Ministers should work out measures and submit them for examination by the committee.

[Kiselev] Thank you. We wish you every success in your new walk of life.

[Yeltsin] Thank you.

Radio, TV To Broadcast Supreme Soviet Live 26 Jun

LD2006200389 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] The Soviet prime minister, Nikolay Ryzhkov, has introduced in the national parliament's commissions and committees candiates to the posts of his deputies, the post of minister of defense and chairman of the State Security Committee.

After members of parliament discussed the candidates they drew conclusions that will be submitted to parliament. Candidates to the national Supreme Court were also considered.

All candidates to these posts must be approved when parliament goes into session in Moscow next Monday. Radio and television will broadcast the session live.

Commission Proposes Ministerial Personnel Changes

18200388 Moscow TRUD in Russian 14 Jun 89 p 1

[Interview with V.Ye. Kurtashin, chairman of the Commission for Questions on the Development of Industry, Energy, Equipment, and Technology, by V. Golovachev; date, place not specified: "Who Will Become a Minister?"]

[Text] V.Ye. Kurtashin, chairman of the Commission of the Soviet of the Union [as published] of the USSR Supreme Soviet for Questions on the Development of Industry, Energy, Equipment, and Technology, shares his thoughts on ways to restructure economic management.

The Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet unanimously elected (which in these times can be called a sensation) Vladimir Yegorovich Kurtashin, a USSR people's deputy from trade unions and general director of the "Kriogenmash" [cryogenic machinery] NPO [scientific production association] to be chairman of the Commission for Questions on the Development of Industry, Energy, Equipment, and Technology. A man of principle who is accustomed to expressing his opinion keenly and directly in any situation, and not looking to higher authorities, he has proved himself to be a talented organizer of production.

[Golovachev] I would like to start with more general questions. In your opinion, what are the basic reasons for the slippage in economic restructuring?

[Kurtashin] One of these is the prevalence of the administrative methods of management, interference of the ministries and departments in the operational activity of enterprises, and underrating the role of collectives in the resolution of existing tasks.

I will cite just one example: We have been fighting with the "notorious gross product." A lot of candidate and doctoral dissertations and monographs and articles have been written about the negative consequences of the application of this indicator. The country is not receiving the needed products. In giving preference to his highness "the gross product," the quality of products is sacrificed, there is a loss of an inexpensive variety of products, and the expenditure of materials and labor resources grows. But we still cannot get rid of the gross product. And today we were not able to avoid planning "from an achieved level," and the ministries and the departments, as previously, maintain strong control over the fulfillment of the plan according to the volume of commodity production and the indicators related to it.

[Golovachev] Will the situation change after the USSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet session?

[Kurtashin] Of course, the planned measures, I think, will make it possible to move forward considerably. But everything depends on how we work, how we are able to convey good ideas into the specific mechanism of economic management, into specific tasks. It is not enough to proclaim the transition to cost accounting—it also has to work.

[Golovachev] But what is preventing this?

[Kurtashin] The reasons are well-known. There is no wholesale trade in the means of production, and it is not likely that there will be any in the near future (although we talk about this more than enough). There is no refined financial-credit system. And, the main thing, in my opinion, there is a need for a more clearly and strictly based concept of economic reform.

[Golovachev] In your view, what is the solution?

[Kurtashin] To realize fully that which we proclaimed: to give real independence to enterprises, taking taxes from them and putting state orders on a competitive, profitable (!) basis—that is, to depart from the dictates of ministries and departments. And, well, of course, revive the economy, see to it that the ruble is really a ruble. Implement a system of measures. There are proposals. For example, many interesting ideas, in my view, were expressed at the congress by the famous economist N. Shmelev.

[Golovachev] You say "depart from the dictates of the ministries and the departments." But you yourself have worked in ministries, you were a chief of a department, and you were the manager of an all-union industrial association (VPO). At that time you probably were convinced that everything would collapse without ministries.

[Kurtashin] I consider the 6 years, during which I managed a glavkom [department] and a VPO, to have been spent in vain. Although, of course, we did something useful. Because, in principle, any management body can play both a useful role and an inhibiting role. Frequently, one or the other gets intertwined. In principle, I think the majority of ministries are unnecessary. There should be organs that do not stand above enterprises, but which are with them. There is a need for—how should they be called?—well, associations, or something, which are created by the enterprises themselves, which are kept on their books, which are accountable to the enterprises, and which "service" them.

We are not completely ready for this yet—the economy is disorganized, the enterprises are monopolists, etc. Under these conditions, you cannot do without ministries, but their reorganization is necessary. That is why there was talk at the congress about ministries of a completely new type, qualitatively different from previous ministries.

[Golovachev] They say that the burden on the workers of ministries is very big. You have worked both on a branch staff and in production—you can make comparisons....

[Kurtashin] If the burden in the ministerial apparatuses is great, then it is caused by unnecessary work. We had 49 persons (there were 15 plants) in the "Soyuzkriogenmash" VPO. Then the "glavmash" [main administration of machinery] was formed—it "looked after" 35 plants. The apparatus grew to 59 persons. But I will say honestly that less than 30 employees—that is, approximately half—really worked. However, not one manager, of course, concerns himself with staff reductions. If you wish, I also erred in this.

[Golovachev] But it is now proposed to reduce the number of ministries in key branches of industry, transport, agroindustry, and the defense complex from 52 to 32, that is, almost by 40 percent. Do you think this is a radical step?

[Kurtashin] Under current conditions, it is unquestionably a serious move in the optimization of the management structure. Although quite a few ministries and committees still remain—57. However, 25 managerial bodies are being eliminated.

[Golovachev] As was reported at the congress, of the 100 persons who were in the government that was formed in 1984, only 10 remain in the proposed new staff. Could you name the new people who today are being recommended for the first time to the positions of ministers and departmental managers?

[Kurtashin] I can, but with a definite reservation. This, I emphasize, is only a proposal. As is well-known, they will have to be confirmed in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Thus, we will start alphabetically (I mean with last names). Gennadiy Pavlovich Bogomyakov has been submitted for confirmation to the position of Minister of the USSR Oil and Gas Industry. Since 1973 he has worked as the first secretary of the Tyumen CPSU obkom [oblast party committee]. Grigoriy Arkadevich Gabrizlants is recommended for the position of Minister of USSR Geology. He is the director of the All-Union Scientific-Research Geological Oil Exploration Institute of the USSR Ministry of Geology. Vladimir Grigoryevich Gribov is being proposed for confirmation as chairman of the board of the USSR Gosbank [state bank]. He is now the chief of the combined department of finances and prices and a member of Gosplan [state planning committee].

Instead of eight, as previously, the new government will have only two deputy managers of state bodies in the rank of Minister of the USSR. This is the first deputy to the chairman of the USSR Gosplan and the chairman of the State Committee for Light Industry at the USSR Gosplan. A recommendation is being made to confirm Lyudmila Elmatovna Davletova as one of the USSR ministers. She is the secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee. Vadim Nikitovich Kirichenko, the manager of the economics section of the administration of affairs in the USSR Council of Ministers.

Next, the Ministry of Medium Machine Building. Here the candidacy of Vitaliy Fedorovich Konovalov is being proposed. He is now the deputy minister in this same branch.

Aleksandr Ivanovich Mikhalchenko, the first deputy of the USSR Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work is being proposed for confirmation as the minister. Polad Adzhievich Polad-Zade (first deputy of the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources) is being submitted for confirmation to the position of Minister of USSR Water Management Construction. Lira Ivanovna Rozenova, deputy chairman of the USSR Goskomtsen [state committee on prices] is being recommended for the position of Goskomtsen chairman.

Now the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification. Here, Yuriy Kuzmich Semenov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for the Fuel and Energy Complex, is being proposed for confirmation. Valeriy Mikailovich Serov, now the deputy chairman of Gosplan, is being recommended for confirmation as chairman of USSR Gosstroy [state construction committee].

I will also name Valeriy Vasilevich Sychev, who has been proposed for the position of chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Management of Quality Production and Standards (now deputy chairman of a state commission of the USSR Council of Ministers), and Stanislav Pavlovich Chernov, who is being recommended to the position of USSR Minister of Defense Industry (he is now the first deputy).

Oleg Nikolayevich Shishkin (now the first deputy minister) is being recommended for USSR Minister of General Machine Building. Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov (now works in the USSR Council of Ministers) is being submitted for confirmation as chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems. Finally, Veniamin Fedorovich Yakovlev, the director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Soviet State Construction and Legislation, is being recommended for the position of USSR Minister of Justice. There are also other proposals.

[Golovachev] In a number of cases, those ministers and managers of departments who are being proposed for retention in the government should either head new management bodies, or the names of the ministries and departments are being changed, and the sphere of their activity is being broadened. Who are we talking about?

[Kurtashin] This is Comrades O.G. Anfimov, B.M. Belousov, V.M. Velichko, V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, V.A. Durasov, S.V. Kolpakov, N.V. Lemayev, V.M. Malyshev, V.S. Pavlov, Z.K. Pervyshin, B.L. Tolstykh, and M.S. Shkabardiya.

[Golovachev] And which of the ministers and managers of departments are being proposed for retention in their positions?

[Kurtashin] V.V. Bakatin, C.A. Brezhnev, M.I.Busygin, V.A. Bykov, A.N. Volkov, Yu.M. Volmer, M.V.Gramov, V.G. Zakharov, Yu.A. Izrael, A.S. Isayev, A.I.Kamshalov, K.F. Katushev, I.V. Koksanov, V.G. Kolesnikov, N.S. Konarev,N.I. Kotlyar, V.A. Kryuchkov, M.F. Nenashev, N.A. Pugin, A.S. Systsov, K.Z. Terekh, Ye.I. Chasov, V.G.Chirskov, E.A. Shevardnadze, M.I. Shchadov, G.A. Yagodin, and D.T. Yazov.

[Golovachev] But it turns out that the number of retained ministers and department heads comes to more than 10. But I recall that at the congress there was talk that of the 100 members of the government, 10 remain in the proposed scheme....

[Kurtashin] What is meant here is the composition of the government formed in 1984. But, as is well-known, many ministers have been changed since then....

I will not talk about the proposed candidacies for the position of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers—this was reported in detail at the congress.

[Golovachev] Do you see any potential for the further improvement of the managerial structure?

[Kurtashin] Yes, unquestionably. For example, the USSR Ministry of the Radio Industry and the Ministry of the Electronics Industry could have been combined into the Ministry of the Radioelectronics Industry. This would make it possible to implement a common scientific-technical policy in these contiguous branches.

In my opinion, it would also be advantageous to combine the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology and the USSR State Committee for the Management of Quality Production and Standards into a USSR State Committee for the Management of Science, Technology, and Quality Production. This proposal is based on the existence of a single methodological approach to the management of science as well as the quality of production.

Furthermore, I do not know whether a State Committee for Forestry is needed. I think that the problem of the use, processing, and preservation (reproduction) of the forest should fall in one department—the USSR Ministry of Forest Industry. This would make it possible to manage the forest resources of the country more effectively and rationally.

[Golovachev] Will the overall numerical size of the apparatuses of the ministries and departments be reduced?

[Kurtashin] I do not have suitable data yet. I have only lists and biographies. But I think our commission will have this data available in a short time. At least, it should be available. Otherwise, extensive analysis will not be possible. I will emphasize that the main thing here is that there not be a "jump" of personnel from one managerial apparatus to another when the managerial structure is activated. But, as we know, this is basically what happens

[Golovashev] Are there any questions on which we, for example, do not agree with the position of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet?

[Kurtashin] Of course. I have already named some. I can also raise another problem. Today, quite a lot of resources are expended on aid to other countries. One of our newspapers cited the figure R20 billion in payments for international obligations. I do not know whether this figure is correct, but, being in an economic crisis, can we spend billions of rubles for this kind of aid to other countries to the detriment of the well-being of Soviet workers? I think not. There are other questions also. No one has a right to the absolute truth. It is born in debates and in the clash of opinions.

[Golovashev] Last question: It is known that you did not very willingly agree to the new appointment. Why? Also: Are you taking a salary cut in this?

[Kurtashin] It is not a question of salary here. It is most likely that I retain my average earnings. But, I repeat, this is not the point. It is simply that in a scientific-production association, and now it is in a scientific-industrial association center which combines 15 plants, I do specific work, and I see the results in front of me.... But, on the other hand, a commission of the Soviet of the Union can make a substantial contribution to the cause of economic restructuring. If, of course, I will not be an extra, but will actively and energetically influence the course of events. The desire to make my own contribution to restructuring in the final analysis overcame all of my doubts.

Continued Reportage on Novyy Uzen Disturbances

Account of Ethnic Clashes Published

PM2006150589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by own correspondent V. Ardayev: "What is Happening in Novyy Uzen"]

[Text] Alma-Ata, 20 Jun, 1500 Moscow time—As has already been reported, on the night of 16 through 17 June riots began in the city of Novyy Uzen (Guryev Oblast, Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]) entailing a wave of atrocities: Groups of hooligans attacked apartment blocks and public and administrative buildings and beat up passersby.

Today this small city on the Mangyshlak peninsula southeast of Shevchenko is the focus of attention of the entire republic. Leaders and responsible workers from Kazakhstan's party, soviet, and law enforcement organs have arrived here. The most diverse and sometimes contradictory reports are coming in from there to Alma-Ata. Only by talking with several responsible workers of the Kazakh SSR Internal Affairs Ministry did I succeed in reconstituting the following picture of the events.

On the evening of 16 June a fight broke out at an open-air dance floor between groups of people of indigenous and Caucasian nationalities (the population of Novyy Uzen is approximately 56,000, including about 20,000 representatives of the peoples of the Caucasus: Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Lezghins, and others). The clash was successfully halted through the efforts of local militia workers. But in the night a crowd of young people armed with sticks, iron bars, and stones tried to break into the building of the city internal affairs department. After warning shots had been fired into the air the attackers dispersed. In the morning on the square in front of the Novyy Uzen party city committee and city soviet executive committee building, a spontaneous meeting took place at which representatives of the indigenous nationality complained to the leaders about their poor social living conditions in the city and the high prices for necessities. They demanded that all people of the Caucasian nationalities be moved from the city and also that the extraction of oil and gas by the duty-tour

method be halted, claiming that those working on a duty tour are under far more favorable conditions than the local population. A clash took place here between groups of people of various nationalities armed with home-made edged weapons, each group numbering 250-300 people. There have been instances of the use of hunting rifles. After the militia workers had stopped the conflict the extremists, dividing into groups, set about smashing cooperative booths, stores, consumer service enterprises, and apartment blocks in the city, and setting fire to automobiles. A tense situation remained in the city that day and next.

On 18 June the operations staff took a decision. Several hundred people of the Caucasian nationalities were evacuated from the city and were there under the guard of the militia and servicemen of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and were provided with food. After a while, when passions had somewhat abated, they were all brought back to the city and settled in their houses.

The situation was complicated by the fact that at the same time on the square in front of the party city committee and city soviet executive committee building, representatives of the indigenous nationality held a demonstration lasting over 24 hours, in which about 5,000-7,000 people took part, including many women and children. The same demand was put forward: Evacuating all people of the Caucasian nationalities from the city and closing the cooperatives they have created....

The night of 19 through 20 June was relatively calm. The square is gradually being cleared of people.

S. Serikov, Kazakh SSR deputy minister of internal affairs, has reported that as a result of the disorders in the city 5 motor vehicles were burned down (including 5 private automobiles, 5 militia special automobiles, and 1 truck), and 9 enterprises, 13 cooperative booths, and 18 small trading points were damaged. A number of apartment blocks were also destroyed. The exact number of casualties is still being ascertained, but it is known that three people of different nationalities have already died in hospital of their wounds. Several militia staffers were injured. On 19 June three hooligans were arrested and were found to have bottles with an incendiary mixture in their possession. A curfew has been imposed in the city.

Clashes Continue; Curfew Imposed

LD2006164189 Moscow TASS in English 1543 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Alma-Ata June 20 TASS—By TASS correspondent Raisa Ioffe:

The situation in the Kazakhstan town of Novyy Uzen, a scene of mass disorders on the night of June 16/17, is returning to normal. Factories are operating, many shops have reopened and the movement of buses has been restored on some routes.

The Presidium of Kazakhstan's Supreme Soviet on June 19 imposed a curfew in order to check disturbances. It remains in effect from 9 p.m. to 6 a.m. local time.

Republican Interior Minister Grigoriy Knayzev has been appointed commandant of the city.

Rallies and demonstrations have been banned. Nonetheless, unauthorised demonstrations and meetings, as well as clashes between warring groups of hoodlums are continuing in the town.

The efforts to stabilise the situation are being hindered by extremists who [words indistinct] their attempts to kindle ethnic conflicts.

Three people, two Kazakhs and one Lezghin, died in the disturbances. According to available information, 27 people applied for medical assistance as of June 20. 42 active participants in the disorders have been detained. Fifty-nine shops were damaged in the disturbances, five state-owned and private cars were burnt, a liquor store was looted and windows of many administrative and apartment houses were broken.

Novyy Uzen is one of the youngest towns in Kazakhstan. It marked its 20th anniversary last year. The town emerged in the Caspian Desert as a centre of the oil and gas industry.

The average age of its residents is under thirty. It is inhabited by Kazakhs, Russians, Azerbaijanis, Georgians, Chechens, Ossets and representatives of other ethic groups who have come to live in this harsh region into which fertile soil has to be brought for parks.

City Party Secretary on Unrest

LD2006202689 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Telephone interview with Niskinut Miskaliyev, first secretary of the Novyy Uzen city party committee; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] The town of Novyy Uzen has unsolved social problems. What are these problems? First and foremost, they are the poor supply of food, a backward social infratructure, and the absence of enterprises to provide jobs for young people. So, together with oblast organizations, our job is to tackle these problems. Some questions are partially being tackled; on the whole, however, the problem of tackling social questions is acute today. This problem was very well put at a meeting of residents conducted on the initiative of the republican newspaper KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA. The young people rightly point out the difficulty of young people of indigenous nationality finding jobs, while at the same time many people are taken on from the side.

Then, too, there is recently the coupon system for getting meat, oil, and especially sugar. These questions have upset young people, as they have all the residents of our town. I think that this is the reason for the massive actions of the young people. We must tackle these questions together with them. Comrades in the republic will be working for this. At present they are going [words indistinct].

More Reports on Stabilizing Situation in Fergana

Organizational Work Detailed

PM1906133389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jun 89 First Edition p 4

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Astafyev telephone dispatch: "Extremists Change Tactics"]

[Text] Fergana, 17 Jun—The situation in Fergana and in the oblast is gradually returning to normal. Enterprises' and establishments' work is getting organized. Within the oblast bus transportation in the rayons and cities has resumed. But as before the curfew continues to operate. Shots can be heard, and fires break out in some places at night. Diverse rumors are spreading among the local population, each one more horrible than the last. Although on the outside everything looks calm, the tension has still not abated.

It would seem that there are no Meskhetian Turks left in the oblast. They have all been evacuated. So why keep people in a state of alarm? Evidently because the organizers of the disorder have quite different aims. Rumors of alleged instances of taunts by Meskhetian Turks against the indigenous population were needed by them to stir up the situation, and possibly also in order to punish those who were not submitting to their will. These forces, which have hitherto remained in the background, stirred up the disturbances on a wide scale, taking advantage of the democratic changes in the country and attempts by certain circles to drive a wedge between the civilian population on the one hand, and the internal forces on the other, which were recently widely publicized not only by a number of press organs, but also from the platform of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, .

As long as the efforts of militia officials and internal forces' soldiers were inhibited by the fact that they had encountered an unusual situation and by certain "overcautious" limitations in the struggle against murderers, arsonists, and rapists, this succeeded. But when they finally met with resolute resistance on the part of the law and order forces, many of those who had been tricked or forced into joining the pogroms returned home. And then the extremists were forced to change tactics.

From open mass actions they switched to terror, sabotage and spreading rumors. They also began to make attempts—and members of the "Birlik" organization are playing by no means the least role in this—to justify the pogroms and the violence, to paint them in a democratic light, and to raise to the status of martyr those who had died in the clashes with the troops. The extremists are now directing their threats primarily against those who gave assistance to the Meskhetian Turks, those who had refused to participate in the disturbances.

Recently Anvar Saliyev, the leader of one of Tashlak's enterprises, was seriously wounded by a shot fired at night through his window. On the night of 15 June in the city of Kuvasay, freight cars containing Meskhetian Turks' belongings were set on fire.

In the oblast, rumors persist about a detachment of Meskhetian Turks armed with submachineguns, which is allegedly hiding somewhere. Supposedly a group of Meskhetian Turks attempted to blow up a dam in Kerkidon. Unknown persons are calling the homes and workplaces of inhabitants of other nationalities, threatening them with violence, and forcing them to leave the republic.

In this situation, in addition to measures to safeguard order and citizens' security, a no less responsible task which is facing soviet and party organs, militia workers, and internal forces' servicemen is that of carrying out explanatory work among the local population. Agitation groups were rapidly set up in the oblast party committee and rayon party committees. This was also discussed at a conference of political workers from internal troops' units and from USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] schools.

"It is essential for us to counter the diverse rumors with efficient, convincing, and well-argued explanatory work," Colonel Ye. Nechayev, deputy chief of the USSR MVD Internal Troops Political Directorate, said at the conference.

The servicemen have joined vigorously in this work. On the initiative of Major General V. Doloban, chief of the USSR MVD Rear Services Higher Military School in Kharkov, and Colonel V. Chernyshev, chief of the school's political department, meetings of political workers and teachers took place with labor collectives and the population at their places of residence in Kuvasay.

In the unit in which political worker Lieutenant Colonel I. Glivka serves, which is temporarily stationed in Kokand, three agitation and propaganda groups headed by experienced political workers were created. Their members visited industrial enterprises and the city's educational establishments, explained to people the situation which had taken shape, and refuted the rumors. Party and Komsomol workers, internationalist soldiers, and representatives of women's soviets and housing committees are taking part in the explanatory work with them.

The situation in the oblast is under control.

Fergana Prosecutor Describes Unrest

PM2006133389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 89 First Edition p 6

[Interview with Fergana Oblast Prosecutor A. Atadzhanov conducted by PRAVDA correspondent A. Kaipbergenov: "It Began Like This. Events in Fergana Oblast"; date and place of interview not specified—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Fergana, 19 Jun— Fergana Oblast Prosecutor A. Atadzhanov talks about the tragic events:

[Atadzhanov] Many people still link the wild rampage of lawlessness with events in the city of Kuvasay 23-24 May. An investigation has established that two young people had a domestic squabble in a city bar. I stress that neither was a Meskhetian Turk or an Uzbek national. Several days later they organized a group brawl, in which, unfortunately, both Meskhetian Turks and Uzbeks took part. Some 150 people assembled on each side 23 May. I drove to the scene of the rally with a group of personnel from the prosecutor's office. Militia staffers prevented any fighting and persuaded the gathering to disperse peacefully. The next morning representatives of the conflicting sides were gathered together and were even reconciled. Unbelievable rumors and "details" began to amass around the incident. A group brawl began on the evening of 24 May, as a result of which 63 people suffered bodily injuries and one person died in the hospital. The tale seemed to have ended here. The prosecutor's office instigated criminal proceedings, two of the people involved in the brawl were arrested, and administrative proceedings were instituted against 13 people.

Meanwhile totally unfounded rumors grew. Barefaced lies were spread around in order to worsen the situation. Ethnic passions were kindled at someone's bidding.

Pulatov, acting prosecutor in Tashlakskiy Rayon, telephoned me 3 June, told me about disturbances, and asked for help. Despite the fact that it was a Saturday, all our personnel were on the spot. Accompanied by several workers from the oblast prosecutor's office, we drove out to Tashlak. We saw an excited mob of people. They did not want to listen to anyone. I noticed people under the influence of drink and drugs in the crowd. I went up to one man. He began to shout frenziedly about the Meskhetian Turkish "casualties" in Kuvasay, the "villainous killing" of children, and "desecrated women." I asked him: How do you know this? He did not hear me. Our staffers noticed many of their "acquaintances"—people against whom criminal proceedings have been instituted in the past and people with previous convictions—in the mob. One of them came up to me saying: My brother is in jail for robbery; let him out, and then I'll calm the crowd down....

The first house was set on fire and the first casualties and pillagers appeared that evening.

[Kaipbergenov] Many people are now saying that the bandits were well organized. How does this look from the viewpoint of the oblast prosecutor?

[Atadzhanov] The duration of the excesses and the pamphlets signed "sacred Uzbeks" indicate they were well organized. One other thing. The attacks on militia and party and soviet committee buildings were hardly accidental. The Uzbekistanskiy Rayon prosecutor's office was set on fire.

[Kaipbergenov] A great deal is now being said to the effect that the bandits were aided by the leaders of party, soviet, and economic organs and Ministry of Internal Affairs workers. Do you have any facts on this?

[Atadzhanov] It is too early to talk about established facts. There is information, which is being checked out. There were cases of bandits' using state motorized transport filled with state gasoline. People traveled to Kokand, for instance, not only from other rayons but even from other oblasts.

[Kaipbergenov] How is the investigation going?

[Atadzhanov] There have been instances of unarmed workers' being attacked and automobile windows smashed. The investigation is proceeding in spite of everything. The culprits will be punished.

Uzbek MVD Colonel Cited

PM2006155589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA special correspondent V. Ardayev report: "Echo of Unrest"]

[Text] Tashkent—The situation has been such that journalists working in Fergana Oblast last week were practically devoid of reliable information on what had happened and was happening outside the oblast. Officials grudgingly told them nothing more than that "some tension is in evidence, but it would be premature to say anything specific."

Meanwhile, all kinds of rumors have been spreading. People have been saying, for example, that the houses of Meskhetian Turks have been totally burned down in Andizhan and Namangan oblasts, and that thousands of armed detachments in buses and trucks are fanning out through the republic.... These rumors are clearly exaggerated and, at times, simply fantastic.

In Tashkent I asked Militia Colonel A. Artemyev, chief of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD] Protection of Public Order Administration, for some explanations.

[Ardayev] Aleksandr Yakovlevich, what kind of repercussions have the events in Fergana Oblast had outside the oblast and throughout the republic in general?

[Artemyev] First of all, they have, of course, had a certain negative impact on neighboring oblasts in the Fergana Valley—on Namangan Oblast, in particular. For example, on 11 June at 2230 in the oblast center, a crowd of some 300 people aged between 16 and 30, armed with axes, sticks, chains, stones, and bottles of gasoline, moved in the direction of districts populated by Meskhetian Turks. The crowd was brought to a halt by security forces close to the railroad station. The hooligans did not respond to appeals by members of party, soviet, and law enforcement bodies, and continued to disturb public order. What is more, they began to yell threats at them and throw stones at militia workers. But the crowd was dispersed. However, approximately 2 hours later another crowd of extremists (this time there were at least 400 people), armed with knives and shouting "Death to the Turks!", tried to burst into the Yangibad quarter. After warning shots had been fired into the air, the crowd broke up. At about 0200, some 500 people brought traffic to a halt in one of the streets in Namangan, again shouting threats at militia workers and throwing stones. A cadet from the Tashkent USSR MVD Higher Militia School was injured as a result of this. Again, shots had to be fired into the air. The crowd was dispersed and one of the participants in the riot was injured and taken to the hospital. Several arson attacks on buildings were successfully prevented that same night. Twenty-eight of the most active participants in the riots were arrested.

This was the most dangerous episode in recent days. However, daily information bulletins on the events report that unsanctioned rallies are being held in various oblasts in the republic, at which people shout extremist slogans and demand the removal of Meskhetian Turks from Uzbek territory. Such rallies have been staged in Chirchik (Tashkent Oblast), Andizhan, Tashkent, Yangiyul (Tashkent Oblast), Ishtykhan (Samarkand Oblast), and Namangan....

At the same time, rallies are also being held by Crimean Tatars and Meskhetian Turks, who are demanding protection against the pogroms and outrages.

Inflammatory leaflets are being circulated in a whole number of regions (but particularly in Samarkand and Tashkent Oblasts). It goes without saying that all this is hardly conducive to calming the population and stabilizing the situation and is causing aggression and panic. One gets the impression that the same forces which organized the arson attacks, pogroms, and murders in Fergana Oblast are continuing to try to achieve their aims by whipping up alarming suspicion and interethnic discord between the many peoples who inhabit Uzbekistan.

CPSU Central Committee Politburo Meets 19 Jun

PM2106093189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Politburo meeting on 19 June examined issues concerning the party organizations' work in connection with the results of the first USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

As was noted at the meeting, the congress was a major event in our country's political history, in setting up a civilian, law-governed state. It marks an important stage in the transfer of state power in its entirety into the hands of the soviets of people's deputies, and shows the immense potentialities of representative bodies in running the country and in resolving the socioeconomic, political and spiritual problems facing society.

In an atmosphere of complete openness and glasnost, valuable experience has been obtained in collectively working out state decisions on the basis of taking into account the interests of all sections of society.

USSR people's deputies brought to the congress major and acute questions, a variety of opinions and assessments, and a critical spirit. They reflected the dissatisfaction with the state of affairs—above all in the economy, in the social sphere, and in interethnic relations—which exists in society.

The frank nature of the discussions which took place has made it possible to see better both achievements and the errors and mistakes which were made during restructuring itself, too.

The Politburo has instructed the CPSU Central Committee deparments to examine in depth the questions raised at the congress relating to their sphere of activity and to determine the practical route to resolving these questions. The central committees of the union republics and the kray and oblast party committees have been recommended to take into account the deputies' critical remarks and proposals regarding the activities of party organizations and committees and the Communist managers of economic bodies and organizations.

It is important that in their work the party organizations should proceed from the principle that resolving urgent vital problems as soon as possible is directly tied up with the consistent implementation of the economic reform, the improvement of work, firm discipline in all sections of the national economy, and resolutely overcoming manifestations of irresponsibility, laxity, and disrespect for the law.

In the light of the results of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the particularly urgent nature of restructuring party and ideological work, of a precise demarcation of party and state functions, and of party committees mastering political methods of management and the art of conducting a dialogue with various social forces was noted. Being the bearer of the ideas of restructuring and its guarantor, the party should restructure itself at a considerably greater speed than the progress of these processes in society.

The information presented by comrades Ryzhkov and Chebrikov on the events in Fergana Oblast, Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic, was examined at the meeting. The need was noted to study in depth the causes of the

events which have had tragic consequences, and to determine ways to solve many social and economic problems characteristic for that region of the country. The republic's party organizations were advised to concentrate their efforts on work with the young, on finding jobs for them, and on solving the tasks of making relations between nationalities healthier in Uzbekistan.

It is necessary to give a principled political evaluation of the things that have taken place, and, using the force of law, to strictly punish the law-breakers and bring to account the party members who have compromised the lofty name of Communist. The criminal forces that prepared and guided outrages and pogroms should be exposed. It is important to launch and maintain broad activity in conducting explanatory and information work among the republic's population, and to show objectively the true causes of the events that have taken place in Fergana Oblast and other oblasts. Cognizance was taken of the fact that the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee will implement the measures necessary for ensuring such conditions for Meskhetian Turks and the whole population—regardless of the nationality—in their places of residence, as will enable them to live and work safely.

The Politburo listened to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's briefing on his visit to the FRG, and approved completely the results of his talks and meetings with FRG Federal President Von Weizsaecher, FRG Federal Chancellor Kohl, other state, political, and public figures, and representatives of the country's business circles. It was noted that comrades Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, and Silayev had useful conversations and meetings within the framework of the visit. The course of the talks and the in-depth exchange of views encompassed the main aspects of bilateral relations and international problems, including disarmament, the construction of the all-European home, and ecological problems. Both sides expressed the firm intention to consistently build up cooperation in all areas on the basis of true good-neighborliness and honest partnership, and to invest it in deeds with new quality and dimension. Thus, the visit became an important event in USSR-FRG relations, and acquired an all-European importance. Its results encompassed the will of the two countries' peoples to put an end to the period of confrontation and to embark upon fruitful interaction for the sake of peace and the well-being of the current and future generations.

The joint statement signed during the visit bears a great political and businesslike charge. It is a broad conceptual basis for relations between the USSR and the FRG for the years to come, proceeding from the principles of new political thinking, and taking appropriate account of the realities of the present time and the strengthening tendency toward overcoming the divison of Europe. Developing the ideas of the Moscow Treaty under new conditions and based on adherence to the postwar order and the inviolability of borders, the joint statement is a major contribution to the modernization of European and international relations as a whole.

The heartfelt cordiality and sincere hospitality shown to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the whole Soviet delegation by the government and also by the broadest strata of the FRG population were met in the USSR with great satisfaction. Soviet people regard this as a manifestation of feelings of sympathy to the country which has resolutely entered the path of restructuring and renewal, and which is consistently seeking to achieve a halting of the arms race and the ridding of the threat of war from mankind.

The meeting examined a report on the results of the official friendly visit by Comrade Shevardnadze to the GDR. It was noted with satisfaction that the exchange of opinions which took place in Berlin with the leadership of the fraternal GDR confirmed the community of positions of the two countries on key questions of bilateral relations, of world and European policy, and their striving to make irreversible the positive changes which have begun in the international situation.

The Politburo meeting also discussed cadre questions and some other questions of party and public life.

Mironenko's Undelivered Congress Speech Published

PM1606134589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 89 pp 1, 2

[Contribution "For the Congress Stenographic Record" by V. Mironenko, USSR people's deputy and first secretary of the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League Central Committee—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] **Not all deputies, including some from the Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol], managed to speak at the first USSR Congress of People's Deputies. It was therefore decided to append the texts of their speeches to the congress stenographic record.**

I support the basic tenets of the reports. The implementation of the program outlined in them will enable young people who love labor and value knowledge to prove themselves and to establish themselves in life without the humiliating need to be a burden on their parents, which is so ruinous for society. These are just possibilities at present. They must become reality. Life will introduce some amendments.

In my opinion, the situation is more or less satisfactory as regards the "maximum program." I saw no sign of a "minimum program." Nor did I sense a clear awareness that we are getting dragged into a vicious circle: In order to solve economic and social tasks, we need political stability; in order to attain political stability, we need to achieve—and achieve quickly—a tangible improvement in people's working and living conditions.

At the 19th all-union party conference we managed to secure recognition of the need to elaborate a strong youth policy. A year has passed since, but there has been no progress.

N.I. Ryzhkov told us what the government intends to do to alleviate the position of low-income categories of the population. But even the list of these categories itself is rather incomplete. For example, there is no mention of students, single mothers, young families living apart in hostels for years and decades on end, and so on.

Young people's problems can be seen by anyone who wants to see them. It seems that so far we either have not seen them or have been unwilling to see them. For as long as young people come last in our reports, they will come first in Ministry of Internal Affairs statistics.

Young people's position in society could be discussed at the Supreme Soviet during the discussion of the draft Law on Young People. There are a few more specific proposals. I will deal with them a little later. Now I wish to voice a few ideas that crossed my mind during the debate which took place at the congress.

We yearned so much for free speech that we are literally wallowing in this totally unprecedented opportunity to say what we think. But to what use are we putting this free speech?!

Maksim Gorkiy, who not only wished to be but **really** was the conscience of Russian intelligentsia, wrote during the first years of Soviet power: "Free speech! It was free speech, we thought, that would help us here in Russia to develop a sense of respect for our neighbor's individuality, for his human rights. But suffering an epidemic of political impressionism and yielding to impressions of the evil of the day [zloba dnya], we use 'free speech' only in violent arguments on the topic of who is to blame for Russia's collapse. But there is really nothing to argue about, because everyone is to blame."

I am afraid **that the 'evil of the day' in our country may be simply transformed into evil [zloba].** If we destroy confidence in democratic institutions of the kind that the congress may become, we will clear the way for some new dictatorship or for power growing out of the pocketbook.

The live relay of the congress has done more for people's political enlightenment, especially young people's, than the entire army of propaganda workers has done in the last 10 years.

But it must also be borne in mind that confidence in an organ of power cannot be consolidated by words. Such confidence is hardly worth anything. It lasts only for as long as it takes to get from the television set to the store or the workplace. Confidence is consolidated by actions. And the main action of the supreme organ of power is legislative activity, the formation of the government, and the monitoring of its work.

I consider the question of preventing the abuse of power a key issue of political as well as economic reform. Our economy is literally crying out for an end to the endless progression of political improvisations and monstrous experiments. Another cause of worry is the fact that, whenever we implement the latest brilliant idea which a person or an organ vested with power has decided to bestow as a boon on our citizens, science either obsequiously consents or keeps silent.

We must think again about the holding of multiple posts in local organs. Public opinion is doggedly resisting this, and we have no right to ignore it. It would also be worth seeking a more felicitous combination of the experience of soviets and parliamentarianism. Maybe local soviets should have two chambers. One to be elected by okrugs. The other one by labor collective councils. In that case, public organizations would contest seats in the first chamber.

I would adopt a very cautious approach toward highfalutin talk to the effect that "Now we constitute all power!" Yes, now we constitute power. But we still have to learn to exercise this power. I would be in no hurry to trample on the proposals of a number of union republic deputies or economists who have spoken here, no matter how unacceptable they might appear at first glance.

Come what may, the peoples of these republics will have the final say, and I am convinced that they will realize where their genuine interests lie. Questions like these cannot be resolved by voting. But let each people and their intelligentsia take a close look at those who shout loudest of all about national issues. Nationalism and chauvinism are quite frequently the last resort of scoundrels. I do not envy the future of a people who protect their own scoundrels simply because they are their own.

I have received many telegrams. They talk about the future of children whose parents were forced to abandon their places of residence in Armenia and Azerbaijan. I ask the governments of these republics to guarantee—not in words but in deeds—the right of people of any nationality to live in their own homes, to work, and to raise their children.

I do not have too much faith in the actual idea of adopting a detailed congress resolution. If we need to resolve anything in the most general terms—apart from what has already been done—then it is to express our attitude toward the reports by the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the Council of Ministers.

Second, it is to confirm that all power in the country belongs to the soviets of people's deputies and to them alone. It is not all that important whether this is done by a decree or in some other form—to confirm that the party exercises political leadership and, engaging in

self-cleansing, acts as guarantor of people's power against any encroachments. It exercises these and other functions in strict compliance with Soviet laws.

Third and last, it is necessary to decide on the list of draft laws which must be prepared, discussed, and adopted as a matter of top priority, as well as a list of laws or decrees which can and must be repealed or have the effect of some individual articles suspended.

It is necessary to embark on the preparation of a new USSR Constitution. I am not convinced by the arguments against this. How can legislative work be done without having an updated [obnovlennyy] Fundamental Law? Amendments to the Constitution must be the exclusive prerogative of the congress.

I think that our new constitution ought to have an article defining the raising of the growing generation as a matter for the whole of society and a most important function of the state, and any action detrimental to this cause as a grave crime against society.

The Komsomol Central Committee and the people's deputies from the Komsomol propose a legal basis for youth policy—a "Law on Youth and Youth Policy in the USSR." The draft is still far from complete but, comrade deputies, I hope that with your help we will succeed in completing it and adopting, it if not now, then at the next Supreme Soviet session.

I express thanks to the congress for backing the idea to set up a Youth Affairs Committee comprising primarily young deputies, and it is also necessary to make provision for corresponding structural links in executive organs of power.

We would thus create legal foundations for a youth policy and a mechanism for its elaboration and implementation. We could embark straightaway on the solution of practical questions perturbing young people and outlined in the mandate of Komsomol deputies, which we submit to the presidium. And also on the implementation of mandates which you, esteemed deputies, received from your young voters.

I mentioned abuse of power. I think that the sole reliable protection against this evil, which has brought about so many calamities, lies in glasnost. Our mass media are actively assimilating their new role. But I would refrain from being overenthusiastic for the time being. Our reaction to dissidence still remains the same. Dissidence is a different matter.

There has been a lot of argument about recently adopted decrees and laws. Many of them were adopted hastily! There was equally as much talk about the reform of judicial proceedings. I believe that trial by jury must be reinstated. It would be a mistake to reject this means of protecting an individual's rights, which has been tried and tested by the history of mankind. It must be restored.

Regarding the intellectualization of organs of power. In principle, there is nothing to argue about here. We all are in favor of competent people entering the organs of power. We have suffered so much from incompetence that at times we forget to ask ourselves: "Competence in what, exactly? In jurisprudence?" But what about the other sciences? Are they any less necessary? If we were to take this path and be consistent, it would become necessary to simply combine the Supreme Soviet and the Academy of Sciences, or to elect all the academicians to the supreme organ of state power.

I would imagine that we would have difficulties here. By no means all the academicians would agree to this. And they would be right!

First, salaries would be lower.

Second, they are educated enough and clever enough—for which they earn large salaries, by the way—to know the golden rule: Everyone must do his job as diligently and as competently as possible, and all of us together must serve our people.

I also hope that the practice of the new Supreme Soviet's work will not bring us to the point where "as a rule" becomes the rule, but will make us realize the need to temporarily release all its members from their full-time jobs.

Whenever I heard or read about the millions confiscated from thieves and embezzlers of state funds, I thought about the unconfiscated millions which are not lying in safe deposit boxes but have been put to work. Day in and day out, this dirty money corrupts thousands of young souls, turning many of them into rogues, thieves, and prostitutes.

Either the Soviet power will find the strength to put an end to the black economy, corruption, speculation, protectionism, and so on, or they will put an end to Soviet power. There is no third option.

The people, with their infallible sense, have realized where the danger lies. They must be heeded. We must demand extraordinary measures to combat unearned income and organized crime and demand, to start with, guarantees of full glasnost on the work of the commission we have set up to study the activity of Gdlyan's group and the charges leveled by it and against it.

And another point. Until such time as we introduce declarations of income, to which citizens in most countries in the world have long been accustomed, we cannot even begin to talk about combating unearned income.

I also propose that the material position and the level and sources of the incomes of USSR people's deputies be made public [predat glasnosti].

Let us be the first to file declarations of income and have them published by, for example, IZVESTIYA, or a special bulletin. We have nothing to hide from the people. People must know everything about their deputies and must trust them.

We all witnessed the response when the problem of our Army's involvement in the civil war in Afghanistan was raised. This is a bleeding wound for hundreds of thousands of people.

I understand and support Sergey Chervonopiskiy's idea that it is necessary to come up with a political evaluation of this war. It seems to me, however, that only the Afghan people themselves and history will provide a full and final answer to the question: "What were we doing there?"

The only thing that can be said now is that our Army must never participate in any civil war outside the country's borders.

But God forbid that anyone build a political career on this pain. God forbid that anyone blame soldiers for having performed their duty, or insult the memory of the dead.

Let us all together show concern for those who will carry all their lives the external and internal scars of this war, as well as those for whom the war is not yet over, who are still in captivity and are still awaited by their mothers.

Shcherbitskiy Interviewed on Congress's Results

LD2006103289 Kiev in English to North America 2330 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Interview with Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central COmmittee, and USSR people's deputy, by unidentified Ukrainian SSR radio and television correspondent—read by announcer]

[Text] Question: What are, to your mind, the main results of the deputies' congress in Moscow, as people's deputy?

Answer: The congress undoubtedly has become an unprecedented event of a historical and international significance. The main political conclusion of the congress is that by expressing the will of the nation the Congress approved the party's policy on restructuring, democratization, and openness. By forming the new highest body of power, the first stage of the political reform in the country has been accomplished.

Another important thing is that the congress underlined a guideline of the second stage of the political reform when a new framework of power bodies and governing bodies in republics, regions, cities, and districts are to be created. In the course of preparation to the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR and local soviets, a reform of political system is to be provided with the new law. Here in our republic the preparation of the draft bill is coming to an end. There are draft bills on amendments in the constitution of the Ukrainian SSR and the law about election of people's deputies of the republic and local soviets.

It is obvious that to make activities of the soviets more effective, they are to be provided with lawful bases.

Another thing I would like to mention is that of interethnic relations where in the focus are pretensions among the participants of the congress. I think that you noticed it. And it is clear because the peoples of our country moved far in economic and cultural development, but for one reason or another interethnic relations were seriously deformed. This fact stipulated the decision to discuss this problem during the next plenary meeting of CPSU Central Committee. It is good that in overwhelming majority of speeches by congress participants there was expressed a warning that the loss of our main wealth, that is friendship of nations, could become an unreparable factor. And we must always keep it in our minds. We got a set example in our country and you know about them.

Question: What would you say about the course of restructuring in economic and social spheres in our republic?

Answer: It is necessary to say that the social-economic situation in our republic in many ways is not simple. On the one hand, in many industries the republic corresponds to the 3d year of the 5-year plan, in some it overlaps it. Among them the rate of national income grows as well as industrial production and actual output of certain consumer goods. For the first time the total value of national income, volumes of industrial production, construction, and agriculture have been obtained due to upgrading labor productivity. We never had such indices before. This work in the economic sphere can be evaluated as positive.

But on the other hand, we did not manage to overcome the detrimental character of the republic's economy. They have not waited for us in the [word indistinct] consumer market as well as in the whole country's finances, money circulation with the inflation growing and emission of money—all these undoubtedly are matters of great concern, especially among people with low incomes. Correspondingly with the decisions of the congress, now we have to increase their pensions, to introduce additional benefits. There are such questions as increase of minimum pension pay for workers and farmers, increase of minimum pensions for war veterans,

invalids, and widows. We need a lot of money to provide free access of medication for war veterans, free city transportation service and other benefits for them.

It is necessary to add that of utmost concern of the party, government, and local bodies is the development of national culture and protection of historical monuments. The environmental problems in Ukraine are to be taken into consideration, too. It is very important issue and needs collaboration of new technology and expenses of course. It is natural that our main [word indistinct] and obligation is the care for every individual. We all have to remember this. The decisions of the first congress of deputies with our joint effort will be carried out.

Sakharov, in London, Urges Caution on 'New' USSR
LD2006205189 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English
2028 GMT 20 Jun 89

[By Tom McMullan, PRESS ASSOCIATION diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Mrs Thatcher's cautious approach to Mr Gorbachev's new Soviet Union—a policy which has been criticised by Western allies—was backed tonight by Soviet human rights campaigner Dr Andrey Sakharov, now a deputy to the people's congress.

Dr Sakharov, on a week's visit to Britain as guest of the government, warned in a lecture at the Royal Institute of International Affairs that if the worst happened the Soviet Union could be a victim of a military coup by conservative elements. He also warned the Soviet nationality problem was so great that the Russian authorities should follow the British example in the way it changed from empire to commonwealth. Dr Sakharov, accompanied by his wife, received an honorary degree at Sussex University on Monday. He is due to receive a further degree at Oxford tomorrow.

He told the audience which included representatives of the Soviet Embassy that the West should be careful about its overtures to the Soviet Union. Western aid could turn out to be like pouring water into the sand and prevent the necessary reforms. He said: "The important thing is not to undertake new initiatives. Wait for real change in the political system. Among supporters of Gorbachev were the British Government and Mrs Thatcher. The caution she is observing now is justified. It does not contradict her earlier policy. It is a revision of that policy taking account of existing circumstances."

Dr Sakharov added: "I suppose our country is now one of the last, if not the last, world colonial power. If this problem is not going to be solved in a constitutional rational way the destruction or downfall of our country is inevitable." He went on: "The country is at the crossroads and faces major reforms. From this position the country can go either way. If it goes too far there could be a fascist military coup especially from the right which is the conservative element."

Central Committee Member Tolubko Dies 17 Jun
LD2006150389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1430 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers announced, with deep sorrow, that on 17 June, after a prolonged and serious illness, Vladimir Federovich Tolubko, CPSU Central Committee member, Hero of Socialist Labor, and chief marshal of artillery, died. The obituary, signed by leaders of the party and the Soviet state and prominent military commanders, said: A true son of the Soviet people, an active participant of the Great Patriotic War, who devoted all his adult life to serving selflessly the socialist homeland and the great cause of the Communist Party, of which he was a member since 1939, has passed away. The bright memory of Vladimir Fedorovich Tolubko will live in our hearts forever, the obituary said.

Riga Rally Produces 'Nothing Very Constructive'
PM2106090389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
19 Jun 89 Morning Edition p4

[Own correspondent I. Litvinova report: "Nothing Very Constructive in the Speeches"]

[Text] Riga—On 17 June the organization "Movement for the National Independence of Latvia" held an authorized rally in Riga's Cathedral Square. In their application for permission to hold the rally, the organizers described its theme as follows: "17 June is the anniversary of the Soviet Union's Stalinist occupation of the independent Baltic states."

As Latvian television commentators pointed out in the evening, the speeches contained a lot of criticism but were short on constructive ideas. The majority of placards—and dozens of them were raised in Cathedral Square—began with the words "we demand...." They were presented in the form of an ultimatum. The central theme of the slogans and speeches was the "restoration of the independent Latvian state." The 2-hour rally ended with a march through the city center. Order was ensured by special groups of people, whose armbands bore the motif of public order squads from the radical wing of the Latvian People's Front and the "Movement for National Independence." In the evening, members of an informal youth organization attempted to stage an unauthorized march through the central streets of Riga. The participants carried banners and shouted slogans. Hooligan actions were quashed by members of the militia.

Draft Law on Amendments to Latvian Constitution

18001178 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA
in Russian 21 May 89 pp 2-3

Draft of Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic law "On Changes and Additions to the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Constitution (Basic Law)"

[Text] The Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet hereby decrees:

1. To make the following changes and additions to the Latvian SSR Constitution:

1.1. To word Chapter 9 in the following way:

CHAPTER 9. SYSTEM AND PRINCIPLES OF ACTIVITY OF SOVIETS OF PEOPLE'S DEPUTIES

Article 78.

Soviets of people's deputies—the Congress of People's Deputies of the Latvian SSR and the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian SSR, local soviets of people's deputies—rayon, city, rayon in city, village and rural—comprise a unified system of representative organs of state authority.

Article 79.

The term of office of soviets of people's deputies is 5 years.
Elections of people's deputies are scheduled no later than 4 months before the expiration of the term of office of the corresponding state authority organs.

Article 80.

Soviets of people's deputies of the Latvian SSR have complete state authority on the territory under their jurisdiction.
The most important issues of republic and local significance are resolved at meetings of the Congress of People's Deputies of the Latvian SSR and sessions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and local soviets of people's deputies or are included on a referendum.

The Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies elects the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet. The local soviets of people's deputies elect the chairman and deputy chairmen of the soviets. The Supreme Soviet, city (cities of republic jurisdiction) and rayon in city soviets of people's deputies have their own presidiums.

Soviets of people's deputies form permanent commissions and create executive and management organs, and also other organs that report to them.
Officials elected or appointed by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies may not hold their positions for more than two consecutive terms.

Any official may be relieved of his position early for violation of the Constitution and laws or improper performance of the duties of his position.

Article 81.

Soviets of people's deputies form people's control organs that comprise a unified republic people's control system which combines state control with social control of the workers at the enterprises, institutions, or organizations.

People's control organs check on the fulfillment of the requirements of the Constitution and laws, state programs, and assignments; they fight against violations of state discipline and social justice, including unjustified price increases and actions that jeopardize the health of the population or cause harm to the environment, manifestation of local prejudice, or a narrow departmental approach to business, and against mismanagement, extravagance, red tape, and bureaucratism; they coordinate the activity of control organs; and they contribute to the improvement of the structure and work of the state apparatus.

Article 82.

Soviets of people's deputies, directly or through the organs they create, guide all branch state, economic, and sociocultural construction, make decisions, provide for their execution, and oversee the implementation of these decisions.

The soviet of people's deputies organizes economic activity on the territory under its jurisdiction on the basis of independence and complete autonomous financing, whereby the economic and sociocultural development of the territory and the well-being of its population are directly dependent on the results of economic activity on the given territory.

Economic and sociocultural activity involving the interests of the entire population on the territory under the jurisdiction of the soviet of people's deputies is carried out only with its agreement. In the event that the local soviet of people's deputies refuses to agree to the implementation of plans of republic-wide significance, the question is resolved by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies.

Article 83.

The activity of the soviets of people's deputies is arranged on the basis of collective, free, and businesslike discussion and scientific substantiation of the solutions to problems, glasnost, regular accountability of executive and management organs and other organs created by the soviets for them and the population, constant supervision of these organs, and extensive enlistment of the population in the work of the soviets.

Soviets of people's deputies and the organs they create take public opinion into account and regularly inform the citizens of their work and the decisions they make. The soviets of people's deputies bring up most important issues of republic-wide and local significance for discussion or for republic or local referendum.

1.2. To word Chapter 10 as follows:

CHAPTER 10. THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Article 84.

Elections of people's deputies are held for single or multiple mandate electoral okrugs on the basis of universal, equal, and direct voting rights with secret voting and free expression of will.

Article 85.

Elections of people's deputies are general: Citizens of the Latvian SSR who have reached 18 years of age have the right to vote.
A citizen of the Latvian SSR who has reached 21 years of age may be elected a people's deputy of the Latvian SSR, and a citizen of the Latvian SSR who has reached 18 years of age may be elected people's deputy of a local soviet of the Latvian SSR.
Military servicemen of the USSR Armed Forces stationed on the territory of the Latvian SSR may vote and be elected regardless of whether or not they have Latvian SSR citizenship.
A citizen of the Latvian SSR may not simultaneously be a people's deputy in more than two soviets of people's deputies.

Individuals who are part of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers and executive commissions of local soviets of people's deputies, with the exception of the chairmen of these organs, the chairman and members of the Latvian SSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision, deputy ministers and chairmen of state committees of the Latvian SSR, leaders of departments, divisions, and administrations of executive committees of the local soviets and their deputies may not be deputies of the corresponding soviet. Judges, procurators, deputy procurators, and state arbitrators may not be deputies of the soviet on whose territory they are performing their functions.
Mentally ill citizens declared incompetent by the court and also those sent for compulsory therapy by court decision do not participate in the elections.

Article 86.

The elections of people's deputies are equal. Each voter has one vote; citizens of the Latvian SSR participate in the elections on an equal basis.

Article 87.

Elections of people's deputies are direct: People's deputies are elected by the citizens directly.

Article 88.

Voting at elections of people's deputies is secret: It is not permitted to monitor the expression of the will of the voters.
Elections of people's deputies are free. Influencing the will of the voter through force, deception, threats, bribery, or any other illegal method or abuse of the expression of their will entails the liability envisioned by the law.

Article 89.

The right to nominate candidates for people's deputies for the various electoral okrugs belongs to labor collectives and student collectives, social organizations, and meetings of voters in their place of residence and military servicemen in their military units.
The number of candidate people's deputies is not limited. Each participant in the pre-election meeting may suggest any candidate for discussion, including himself. Any number of candidates may be included on the ballot.

Expenditures involved in preparing for and conducting the elections of people's deputies are financed by the state. Financing the electoral campaign from other sources is prohibited.

Article 90.

Preparations for the elections of people's deputies are conducted publicly and openly.
The elections are conducted by electoral commissions that are formed from representatives of labor collectives, student collectives, social organizations, and meetings of voters in their place of residence and military servicemen in their military units.

Latvian SSR citizens, labor collectives, student collectives, and social organizations are guaranteed the opportunity for free and comprehensive discussion of the political, business, and personal qualities of the candidate for people's deputy, his ability to perform the duties of the deputy, the program for his future activity, and also the right to campaign for and against the candidate at meetings, in the press, and on television and radio.

The policy for holding elections of people's deputies is defined by the Latvian SSR law on elections of people's deputies of the Latvian SSR and the Latvian SSR law on elections of people's deputies of local soviets of the Latvian SSR.

The Central Electoral Commission of the Latvian SSR is in charge of preparing for and conducting elections of people's deputies of the Latvian SSR and deputies of local soviets of people's deputies throughout the entire territory of the republic.

Article 91.

Voters give orders to their deputies.
Soviets of people's deputies consider all orders and take into account the orders that are accepted when drawing up plans for economic and social development and establishing a budget and also when preparing decisions regarding other issues, and in conjunction with the deputy they organize the fulfillment of orders and inform the citizens of this.
The deputy must do everything he can to carry out the orders of the voters.

1.3. To word Chapter 12 as follows:

CHAPTER 12. THE LATVIAN SSR CONGRESS OF PEOPLE'S DEPUTIES AND THE LATVIAN SSR SUPREME SOVIET

Article 97.

The highest organ of state authority in the Latvian SSR is the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies.
The Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies is authorized to take under consideration and resolve any issue pertaining to the Latvian SSR.
The executive authority of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies includes:
1) adopting the Latvian SSR Constitution, making changes in it, and adopting laws directly envisioned by the Latvian SSR Constitution;
2) ratifying the union agreement or the USSR Constitution; making a decision to secede from the USSR;
3) adopting decisions regarding questions of the national-state structure of the Latvian SSR;
4) determining the state boundaries of the Latvian SSR; adopting decisions concerning changing the boundaries between the Latvian SSR and other union republics by mutual agreement, and raising these issues for approval by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies;
5) determining the basic directions for the internal and foreign policy of the Latvian SSR;
6) establishing long-range state plans and the most important programs for the economic and social development of the Latvian SSR;
7) adopting decisions concerning the possibility of creating ecologically dangerous facilities and shutting them down;
8) electing the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet;
9) electing from the people's deputies of the Latvian SSR the chairman, his first deputy, and the secretary of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet;
10) confirming the chairman the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers;
11) electing the Committee for Constitutional Supervision in the Latvian SSR;
12) confirming the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Court, the head state arbitrator of the Latvian SSR, and the chairman of the Latvian SSR People's Control Committee;
13) confirming the procurator of the Latvian SSR and relieving him of his position;
14) revoking acts adopted by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet;
15) revoking acts of local soviets of people's deputies in cases stipulated by Part 3 of Article 82 of the present Constitution;
16) adopting decisions on conducting a vote (referendum).

The Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies adopts laws of the Latvian SSR and decrees by a majority of votes from the overall number of people's deputies of the Latvian SSR, and in cases stipulated by points 1-4, 7, and 14-16 of the present article, by a majority of two-thirds of the votes of the overall number of people's deputies of the Latvian SSR.

Article 98.

The Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies consists of 337 people's deputies who are elected as follows:
325 deputies from the territorial electoral okrugs with an equal number of voters;
12 deputies from USSR Armed Forces units stationed on the territory of the Latvian SSR.
People's deputies of the USSR elected from the Latvian SSR participate in the work of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies with the rights of a voice but no vote.
People's deputies of the Latvian SSR may join together into deputy groups.

Article 99.

The Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies is convened for its first meeting no later than 2 months after the elections. At the request of the mandate commission that elected it, the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies adopts a decision to recognize the credentials of deputies, and in the event of violation of legislation concerning elections, it declares the elections of certain deputies invalid.
The Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies is convened by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.
Regular meetings of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies are held once a year. Extraordinary meetings are convened on the initiative of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, or no less than one-fifth of the people's deputies of the Latvian SSR or no less than one-fifth of the rayon or city (cities of republic jurisdiction) soviets of people's deputies.

The first meeting of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies after the elections is opened by the chairman of the Central Electoral Commission. He also takes charge of the elections of the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet. After that the meetings of the congress are conducted by the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet or his deputy.

Article 100.

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet is a permanent legislative, management, and supervisory organ of state authority of the Latvian SSR.
The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet consists of 100 deputies elected by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies by secret voting from the Latvian SSR people's deputies. Nominations of candidate deputies to the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet are made by deputy groups and also deputies, taking into account the need for representative of all rayons and cities under republic jurisdiction in the Latvian SSR.
USSR people's deputies elected from the Latvian SSR have the right to participate with a voice but no vote in the work of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.
The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet is accountable to the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies. The Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies annually replaces one-fifth of the personnel of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Article 101.

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet is annually convened by the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet for its regular—spring and autumn—sessions. The length of the session is determined by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.
Extraordinary sessions are convened by the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet on its initiative or at the suggestion of the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet or no less than one-third of the members of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

The session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet consists of plenary meetings of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet which are led by the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, and also meetings of the permanent commissions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet held in the intervening period.

Upon expiration of the term of office of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet retains its authority right up until the formation by the newly elected Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies of the new Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Article 102.

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet:

1) schedules elections of people's deputies of the Latvian SSR and people's deputies of local soviets of the Latvian SSR and also people's assessors of people's courts of the Latvian SSR and confirms the members of the Latvian SSR Central Electoral Commission;

2) convenes regular and extraordinary meetings of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies;

3) appoints the chairman of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers and at his suggestion confirms the members of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers and makes changes in it;

4) at the suggestion of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers, establishes an administrative-territorial structure of the Latvian SSR and makes changes in it and approves changes of boundaries between administrative-territorial units;

5) elects the Latvian SSR People's Control Committee, the Latvian SSR, the Latvian SSR Supreme Court, and the Latvian SSR people's judges and state arbitrators, and approves the Latvian SSR State Arbitration Board and also the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Court;

6) at the suggestion of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers, it creates and abolishes state committees and ministries of the Latvian SSR;

7) makes decisions regarding questions of special economic zones and their legal conditions;

8) hears reports from organs they have formed or elected, and also the officials they have appointed or elected with the exception of judges and people's assessors;

9) provides for uniformity of the law on the territory of the Latvian SSR; suspends the execution of acts of USSR state administrative organs on the territory of the Latvian SSR in the event that they do not correspond to the Constitution and laws of the Latvian SSR;

10) provides legislative regulation of social relations pertaining to the competence of the Latvian SSR with the exception of legislative regulation determined in point 1 of Article 97 of the Latvian SSR Constitution;

11) brings up for public discussion drafts of the most important laws and other questions of state life;

12) gives an interpretation of the laws of the Latvian SSR;

13) establishes the policy for the organization and activity of the republic and local organs of state authority and administration and also the policy for the creation of republic social organizations and their legal status;

14) presents for the approval of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies drafts of future state plans and the most important programs for the economic and social development of the Latvian SSR; approves state plans and programs for the economic and social development of the Latvian SSR and the state budget of the Latvian SSR; oversees the course of the fulfillment of the plan and the budget; confirms reports of their fulfillment; if necessary, makes changes in the plan or the budget;

15) ratifies or denounces international agreements of the Latvian SSR and resolves problems of the opening and closing of diplomatic representations, consular institutions, and representations of trade and other organizations of the Latvian SSR;
16) oversees the conclusion of agreements concerning loans and credit received from foreign sources;
17) oversees the foreign ties of the Latvian SSR and the observance of contractual commitments in this area;
18) decides the question of opening permanent representations of the Latvian SSR under the highest organs of authority of the USSR and other union republics;
19) checks on the observance of the Constitution and the laws by state and social organs, enterprises, institutions, and organizations, including units of the Armed Forces, state security organs, internal affairs organs and units, and also enterprises of the defense industry located on the territory of the Latvian SSR;
20) considers questions of the national policy of the Latvian SSR;
21) institutes state awards of the Latvian SSR;
22) publishes acts of amnesty within the competence of the Latvian SSR;
23) revokes ukases and decrees of the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, instructions from the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, and decrees and instructions form the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers;
24) abolishes decisions of rayon and city (cities under republic jurisdiction) soviets of people's deputies of the Latvian SSR (with the exception of cases envisioned by Article 82 of the present Constitution) in the event that they do not correspond to the law;
25) resolves other issues within the competence of the Latvian SSR with he exception of those that are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies.

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet adopts laws of the Latvian SSR and decrees by a majority of the votes of the overall number of deputies.

Laws and decrees adopted by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet must not contradict the Constitution or laws and other acts adopted by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies.

Article 103.

The right to legislative initiative at the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet belongs to the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, the Committee for Constitutional Supervision of the Latvian SSR, the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers, permanent commissions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, USSR people's deputies elected in the Latvian SSR, people's deputies of the Latvian SSR, the Latvian SSR People's Control Committee, the Latvian SSR Supreme Court, the Latvian SSR procurator, the Latvian SSR head state arbitrator, and also social organizations in the form of their republic organs and the social consultative council of nationalities under the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Article 104.

Drafts of laws brought up for the consideration of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies or the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet are discussed at meetings of the congress, permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet, and at its plenary sessions.

In cases where the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies or the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet introduce draft laws or drafts of decisions that entail violation of the republic's sovereignty or a violation of the Latvian people's right to self-determination—under conditions of complete freedom to determine their own domestic and foreign political status without intervention from outside and to carry out their political, economic, social, and cultural development at their own discretion, the draft is accepted only if all the deputies in attendance at the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies or the session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet vote in favor of it.

Article 105.

The Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet is accountable to the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet as an organ that provides for the organization of the work of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and exercises other authority within the limits of the authority envisioned by the Constitution and the laws of the Latvian SSR.

The Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet includes the positions of chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, first deputy chairman, deputy chairmen, and secretary of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, and chairmen of permanent commissions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

The Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet is headed by the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Article 106.

The Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet:
1) convenes sessions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet;
2) organizes the preparation for meetings of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and sessions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet;
3) coordinates the activity of the permanent commissions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet;
4) renders assistance to people's deputies of the Latvian SSR in exercising their authority and providing them with the necessary information;

5) exercises authority in preparing for elections granted to it by the law on elections of Latvian SSR people's deputies and the law on elections of people's deputies of the local soviets of the Latvian SSR;
6) organizes the process of preparing for and conducting voting (referendums) and also people's discussions of draft laws of the Latvian SSR and other extremely important issues of state life;
7) confers state awards of the Latvian SSR;
8) resolves issues of acceptance for citizenship, release of citizenship, and deprivation of citizenship of the Latvian SSR; resolves questions of granting asylum;
9) exercises authority over people convicted by Latvian SSR courts;
10) appoints and recalls permanent representatives of the Latvian SSR in higher organs of authority in the USSR and other union republics;
11) makes suggestions concerning the release of representatives of central administrative organs of the USSR to the Latvian SSR;
12) appoints and recalls diplomatic representatives of the Latvian SSR to foreign countries and in international organizations;
13) accepts credentials and letters of recall of accredited diplomatic representatives of foreign countries;
14) earmarks necessary measures for providing for state security and public order; in conjunction with the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, resolves the question of declaring a state of war or emergency throughout the republic and in individual cases introducing special forms of control that are administered by the state organs of the USSR or the Latvian SSR;
15) publishes in the Latvian and Russian languages laws of the Latvian SSR and other acts adopted by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, and the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

The Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet adopts ukases and decrees by the majority of votes from the overall number of members of the Presidium, with the exception of cases envisioned by point 14 of the present article, when a majority of two-thirds of the overall number of members of the Presidium is required.

Article 107.

The chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet is the highest official of the Latvian SSR and represents the Latvian SSR within the country and in international relations; the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet is elected by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies by a secret vote for the term of office of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and for no more than two consecutive terms. He can be recalled early by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies through secret voting at the suggestion of the Latvian SSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision.

The chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet is accountable to the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Article 108.

The chairman of he Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet:
1) provides general leadership of the preparation of issues subject to consideration by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet; leads meetings of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, and the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet; signs laws of the Latvian SSR and other acts adopted by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, and the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet;
2) submits to the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet reports on the situation of the republic and important issues of the domestic and foreign policy of the Latvian SSR;
3) brings up for the consideration of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies proposals concerning revoking decisions of local soviets of people's deputies in cases envisioned by Part 3 of Article 82 of the present Constitution;
4) submits to the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies candidates for election to the positions of first deputy chairman, deputy chairman, and secretary of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, and also suggestions concerning the personnel of the Latvian SSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision;
5) submits to the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet candidates for appointment or election to the positions of chairman of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the Latvian SSR People's Control Committee, chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Court, head state arbitrator of the Latvian SSR, and also submits these officials or the Latvian SSR procurator for approval by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies;
6) conducts negotiations and signs interstate agreements of the Latvian SSR.

The chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet issues instructions.

The first deputy chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and the deputy chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet perform individual functions on the authority of the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and replace the chairman when he is absent or cannot perform his duties.

Article 109.

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet elects from the members of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and other deputies of the Latvian SSR a commission for constitutional legislation and also permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet for doing draft legislation work and preliminary consideration and preparation of questions

pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet in order to contribute to implementing the laws of the Latvian SSR and other decisions adopted by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and for overseeing the activity of state organs and organizations.

A social consultative council of nationalities is formed under the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

If necessary the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet creates investigatory, inspection, and other commissions to work on any issue.

Article 110.

Laws of the Latvian SSR and decrees of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet are adopted as a rule after preliminary discussion of the drafts by the corresponding permanent commissions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

The appointment and election of officials of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, the Latvian SSR People's Control Committee, the Latvian SSR Supreme Court and its presidium, and also the confirmation of the Latvian SSR State Arbitration Board are done in keeping with conclusions of the corresponding permanent commissions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

All state and social organs, organizations, and officials must meet the requirements of the commissions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and provide them with the necessary materials and documents.

Recommendations of the commissions are subject to mandatory consideration by state and social organs, institutions, and organizations. Commissions should be notified of the results of the consideration and measures that have been adopted within the established time periods.

Article 111.

The Latvian SSR people's deputy and the USSR people's deputy elected in the Latvian SSR at meetings of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and sessions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet have the right to address a request for information to the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers, and leaders of other organs formed, elected, or confirmed by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, and also to leaders of departments of the Latvian SSR formed by the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers. The organ or official to whom the request is addressed must give a verbal or written answer to the question asked at the given meeting of the congress or at the given session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet within no more than 3 days.

Latvian SSR people's deputies are released from performance of their job or production duties for a particular period necessary for conducting deputy activity at the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, permanent and other commissions, and also with the population. People's deputies of the Latvian SSR elected to the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet can be released from performance of their job or production duties for the entire period of their term in the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

A Latvian SSR people's deputy cannot be held criminally liable, detained, arrested, or subjected to search or other administrative measures imposed judicially without the agreement of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, and during the period between sessions—without the agreement of the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

In the event of a threat to the person of a Latvian SSR people's deputy, members of his family, or his property, the state provides for his safety.

Article 112.

The Latvian SSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision is elected by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies for a period of 10 years from among specialists in the area of law and includes a chairman, deputy chairman, and five committee members.

Individuals elected to the Latvian SSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision when performing their duties are independent and subject only to the Latvian SSR Constitution.

The Latvian SSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision:

1) on its own initiative or on instructions from the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies submits to the congress conclusions concerning the correspondence to the Latvian SSR Constitution of Latvian SSR draft laws subject to consideration by the congress;

2) on its own initiative, on instructions from the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, or at the suggestion of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, submits to the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet conclusions concerning the correspondence of acts of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and also draft acts of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet to the Latvian SSR Constitution and laws of the Latvian SSR adopted by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies;

3) on its own initiative, on instructions from the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, or at the suggestion of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, considers the question of the correspondence of normative acts of other state organs of the Latvian SSR and republic organs of social organizations to the Constitution and laws;

4) on its own initiative, on instructions from the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, or at the suggestion of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, gives conclusions concerning the correspondence of acts of USSR state administrative organs to the Constitution and laws of the Latvian SSR;
5) gives conclusions concerning violation of the Constitution and laws by high officials;
6) gives conclusions concerning the correspondence of regulations and activity of republic social organizations to the Constitution and laws.

When establishing the contradiction of a law adopted by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet to the Latvian SSR Constitution or laws adopted by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, the Latvian SSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision sends its conclusion to the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies or the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet. Sending this conclusion halts the execution of the corresponding law of the Latvian SSR until it is revoked by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet or until the question is considered by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies.

When establishing the contradiction of another normative act of the Latvian SSR to the Constitution or law, the Committee for Constitutional Supervision of the Latvian SSR makes a decision on rendering such an act invalid.

When establishing cases of violation by high officials of the Latvian SSR Constitution and laws, the Committee for Constitutional Supervision of the Latvian SSR raises the question of removing these officials from their positions and also holding them liable.

When establishing the lack of correspondence between the regulations or activity of a republic social organization and the Constitution or laws, the Committee for Constitutional Supervision of the Latvian SSR makes its suggestions to the corresponding state organ.

People on the Committee for Constitutional Supervision of the Latvian SSR can be relieved of their duties before the expiration of their term only at their personal request, in the event that they are convicted of a crime, of if it is impossible for them to perform their functions because of a loss of competence or the ability to work. A decision to relieve the chairman, deputy chairman, or a member of the Committee for Constitutional Supervision of the Latvian SSR before the expiration of their term is made by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies at the suggestion of the Committee for Constitutional Supervision of the Latvian SSR.

A member of the Committee for Constitutional Supervision cannot be held criminally liable, detained, arrested, or subjected to search or other administrative measures imposed judicially without the agreement of the Committee for Constitutional Supervision adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the committee.

The organization and procedure for the activity of the Committee for Constitutional Supervision of the Latvian SSR are determined by the law.

Article 113.

The Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet oversee the activity of all state organs under their jurisdiction.

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet directs the activity of the Latvian SSR People's Control Committee, which heads the system of people's control organs.

The organization and procedure for the activity of people's control organs are determined by the law.

Article 114.

The procedure for the activity of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, and their organs is determined by the regulations of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet adopted on the basis of the Latvian SSR Constitution.

1.4. Articles 152, 153, and 155 of Chapter 18 "The Court and Arbitration" are to be worded as follows:

Article 152.

All courts in the Latvian SSR are formed on the basis of election of judges and people's assessors.

Judges of the Latvian SSR Supreme Court and people's judges of the rayon (city) people's courts are elected by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

People's assessors of the Latvian SSR Supreme Court and people's assessors of rayon (city) people's courts are elected at meetings of citizens at their places of residence or employment.

Judges of all courts of the Latvian SSR are elected for a period of 10 years, and people's assessors—for a period of 5 years.

Judges and people's assessors can be recalled by the organs that elected them or the voters only if they have been convicted of a crime, if they discredit themselves by immoral acts, or if it is impossible for them to perform their duties because they have become incompetent or unable to work.

Article 153.

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet is the highest judicial organ of the Latvian SSR and oversees the judicial activity of the courts of the Latvian SSR.

The Latvian SSR Supreme Court consists of a chairman, his deputies, members, and people's assessors.

The organization and policy for the activity of the Latvian SSR Supreme Court and the people's courts are determined by the Latvian SSR law on the judiciary.

Article 155.

Judges and people's assessors are independent and subject only to the law.

Judges and people's assessors are provided with conditions for unimpeded and effective exercise of their rights and responsibilities. Any intervention in the activity of the judges and people's assessors in carrying out justice is forbidden and entails liability under the law.

Judges of all courts of the Latvian SSR and people's assessors of the Latvian SSR Supreme Court cannot be held criminally liable, detained, arrested, or subjected to search or other administrative measures imposed judicially without the agreement of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, and during the period between sessions without the agreement of the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

People's assessors of people's courts of the Latvian SSR when performing their duties in court cannot be held criminally liable, arrested, or subject to administrative measures imposed judicially without the agreement of the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

2. In connection with the new edition of Chapters 9, 10, and 12 of the Latvian SSR Constitution, ensuing changes and additions are to be made to the following articles of the Latvian SSR Constitution:

2.1. Part 1 of Article 70 after the words "to the jurisdiction of the USSR" add the words "at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies."

2.2. Article 92 should be supplemented after Part 2 with a new Part 3 of the following content:

"A deputy may participate with the right of a voice but no vote in the work of the lower soviets on whose territory his electoral okrug is located."

Part 3 should be considered Part 4.

2.3. Article 93 is to be worded as follows:

Article 93.

"A deputy exercises his authority, as a rule, without interrupting his production or job activity.

"For the time of the meetings of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, sessions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, or local soviets of people's deputies, and also for the exercise of deputy authority in other cases envisioned by the law the deputy is relieved of his production or job duties and is reimbursed for expenditures related to deputy activity with funds from the republic or local budget."

2.4. Part 1 of Article 94 is to be worded as follows:

"The deputy has the right to request information from the corresponding state organs and officials, who are obligated to give an answer to the inquiry made at the given meeting of the Congress of People's Deputies or the given session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet within no more than 3 days."

2.5. Article 96 is to be worded as follows:

Article 96.

"The deputy must report on his work and the work of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, or the local soviet of people's deputies to the voters and the collectives that nominated him as people's candidate.

"A deputy who is not performing or not keeping up with his deputy duties and also one who has deviated from his pre-election program and the mandates of the voters can be recalled by a decision of the majority of the voters of the corresponding electoral okrug according to the policy established by law."

2.6. Article 117 is to be worded as follows:

Article 117.

"The Latvian SSR Council of Ministers is responsible to the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and is accountable to them.

"The newly formed Latvian SSR Council of Ministers brings up for the consideration of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet the program of the forthcoming activity for its term of office.

"The Latvian SSR Council of Ministers reports no less frequently than once a year on its work to the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet."

2.7. Part 1 of Article 118 is to be worded as follows:

"The Latvian SSR Council of Ministers is authorized to resolve all issues of state management under the jurisdiction of the Latvian SSR since, according to the Latvian SSR Constitution, they are not within the area of competence of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies, its Presidium, or the chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet."

2.8. Article 120 is to be worded as follows:

Article 120.

"The Latvian SSR Council of Ministers, on the basis and in execution of the Constitution and laws and also other decisions of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, publishes decrees and instructions and organizes and oversees their implementation. Decrees and instructions of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers are mandatory throughout the entire territory of the Latvian SSR."

2.9. In Article 122 of Part 4 the words "on the basis and in execution of the laws of the USSR and the Latvian SSR and other decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium and the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium" are to be replaced with the words "on the basis and in execution of the laws and other decisions of the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet."

2.10. Article 128 is to be worded as follows:

Article 128.

"The work of rayon, city, and rayon in city soviets of people's deputies is organized by their presidiums which are headed by the chairmen of the soviets, and in city (cities under rayon jurisdiction), village, and rural soviets by the chairmen of these soviets.

"Sessions of local soviets of people's deputies are convened as necessary, but no less frequently than four times a year.

"Sessions of rayon, city, and rayon in city soviets of people's deputies convene the presidiums of these soviets, and the sessions of city (cities under rayon jurisdiction), village, and rural soviets are convened by their chairmen."

2.11. Article 133 is to be worded as follows:

Article 133.

"Executive and management organs of the local soviets of people's deputies are chosen by their executive committees.

"Executive committees report to the soviets that elected them no less frequently than once a year and also at meetings of labor collectives and in the place of residence of the citizens."

2.12. Article 165 is to be worded as follows:

Article 165.

"The procurator of the Latvian SSR is appointed by the USSR procurator general and confirmed by the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and is released from his duties at the suggestion of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR procurator general. Rayon and city procurators are appointed by the Latvian SSR procurators."

2.13. Article 173 is to be worded as follows:

Article 173.

"A change in the Latvian SSR Constitution is made by a decision of the Latvian SSR Congress of People's Deputies adopted by a majority of no less than two-thirds of the overall number of Latvian SSR people's deputies."

[Signed] **Chairman of the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet**
Secretary of the Presidium of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet

Data on 1957 South Urals AES Accident Declassified

LD2006170689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Data about the accident that took place near the Urals town of Kasli in 1957 have been declassified. It was discussed at a news conference in connection with the forthcoming construction in those localities of an atomic power station.

A defense enterprise in the South Urals was built during the course of work to create a nuclear shield for the country. Due to a lack of essential experience at that time, individual areas were polluted. In September 1957, a chemical explosion took place which destroyed a tank used for keeping wastes containing radioactive elements. From their fall-out, radioactive traces formed on the ground. The discharge came to about 2 million curies of radioactive elements. In Chernobyl, 50 million curies were discharged. Nobody died during the accident. More than 10,000 people were resettled within a short period of time from the polluted district. The incident was not talked about earlier since the matter concerned a defense enterprise. By 1978, as a result of the measures that had been taken, it was possible to renew economic activity on 80 percent of the area that had been affected by radiation, while a reserve was created on the remaining area.

The site for the construction of the south Urals [Yuzhno-Uralsko] AES [Nuclear Electric Power Station] was not selected by chance. Since 1957, certain reservoirs here have been quite polluted. By taking out water from them and evaporating it, the AES will in this way clean them up. Apart from that, there are good specialists in the region who are capable of ensuring the efficient work of the station.

At present, an independent experts commission is at work in Chelyabinsk Oblast to thoroughly appraise the draft for the AES and the degree of security for the

construction of the station in those parts. A public opinion poll is being conducted. All of this should resolve the fate of the atomic power station in the South Urals.

IAEA Experts Evaluate Gorkiy Nuclear Station

18220146 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Jun 89 p 4

[Interview with (Ye. Yaremi), Canadian specialist in the area of atomic energy safety, by S. Turanov; date, place not specified]

[Text] **For many months thousand of Gorkiy residents have been living in a state of tense anticipation: How will the problem of the nuclear heating plant (AST) that is being constructed literally next to the city be resolved? This question was raised by a group of scientists on the pages of our newspaper in an article entitled "Atomic Boilers: Doubts at the Start" (SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 26 March of this year). In particular it suggests subjecting the very idea of the AST to a careful expert evaluation. Including—relying on foreign experience.**

A couple of days ago a group of experts of the International Atomic Energy Agency under the United Nations (IAEA) arrived in the Soviet Union to conduct an international independent expert evaluation of the Gorkiy Nuclear Heating Plant. The problem it will have to deal with is discussed by the group's leader (Ye. Yaremi), an eminent Canadian specialist in the area of nuclear energy safety:

[(Yaremi)] In many countries the public is against further development of nuclear energy. But today people are bothered by more than the threat of an accident and the effects of radiation on the health. In recent years a great deal of concern has been caused by the deterioration of the ecological situation because of the utilization of traditional energy sources—for example, the burning of organic fuel.

One should say that the attitude toward the problem depends largely on the energy bearers one country or another has at its disposal. For instance, in France or Japan there are no alternatives to nuclear stations for producing electric energy. Unless, of course, they resort to importing coal or oil. Therefore, their decision in favor of nuclear energy was largely linked to the economic and political aspects—they do not want to be dependent on other countries.

[Turanov] How does the IAEA conduct an expert evaluation of the safety of nuclear stations?

[(Yaremi)] A couple of years ago the main form of our agency's activity was the exchange of technical information on nuclear energy. We gave help on specific problems only to developing countries. But even this work, as a rule, was performed by one or two specialists.

About 5 years ago we began to send groups of experts—the so-called "Osart" groups—to test the operational safety of the plants. Each of them includes approximately 15 highly qualified specialists. They usually spend up to 3 weeks studying a specific AES [nuclear energy plant]. Such a group, for example, went last year to the Rovenskaya AES. At the same time we are expanding the scope of the services we offer—we are not only examining concepts and technical solutions but also investigating construction designs of the station and evaluating the quality of the design requirements. This is the formula used for evaluating the Gorkiy plant.

[Turanov] Who was the initiator of it? How is the evaluation going?

[(Yaremi)] A group of 16 IAEA experts have arrived at the invitation of the Soviet Union. The first stage of the evaluation is now in progress, and the second will take place in August. The result of our work will be a substantiated evaluation of the plant's safety.

One must note the completely free exchange of information that is taking place between our group and Soviet specialists. Even before we arrived in your country we received documentation translated into English. During our conversations with dozens of Soviet experts we asked for additional information. It was always given to us.

[Turanov] In the current stage of the evaluation have you developed any opinion of the safety of the Gorkiy "atomic boiler"?

[(Yaremi)] As of the present moment I can only say that I can see no reason why the plant should not be put into operation.

[Turanov] Is the IAEA planning evaluations of other nuclear plants in the Soviet Union?

[(Yaremi)] As far as I know, there has been a request to conduct an analysis of the safety of the Ignalinskaya AES in Lithuania.

Krasnoyarsk Nuclear Waste Project Attacked

PM2106094389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 89 p 1

[N. Savelyev article under the "Regular Daily Spot" rubric: "Tunneling Under the Yenisey"]

[Text] A strange picture opened up before us.... Dead center, there were five very long, rust-resistant pipes looking like five gun barrels mounted in the field. Not a living soul was to be seen near the mobile crane and concrete conduits. In the background, there was a birch coppice, a hamlet, and a dusty road. We (with me in the car were Sergey Zadereyev, a writer, and Viktor Prokopenko, a local journalist) were making our way slowly, with stops, along the pipeline. Around 400 meters into

this uninhabited terrain the pipes disappeared, as if they had ceased to exist. The road suddenly turned into a quagmire. We spooked a flock of wild ducks and then drove into the field. From there it was constantly uphill almost to the river itself.

The enormous jaw of the tunnel grinned dark and misty. Several men had lit a fire close by the tunnel. We were greeted very sullenly.

"How do we get to N?"—we asked, in order at least to start up a conversation somehow. One of the seated men pointed toward the hill and then turned away without any explanation of any sort.

"What are you building?" Prokopenko asked in an artificially cheerful voice, breaking the prolonged silence. The peasants were not slow to reply: "Surely you know we're building a subway? It's clear, isn't it?"

They know how to keep a secret here. The "subway"—which is nothing less than a burial site being built for radioactive waste material from CEMA nuclear power stations—is coyly called "Site No 27" here. The site has recently given rise to much rumor and commotion. Only now, in the period of glasnost, has it become known what kind of tunnel is being excavated in the birch coppice. But 10 years ago no one dared approach the facility closely, let alone ask questions. If it is necessary then that means it is necessary—these things are more evident on high. And the land and the birch thickets were allocated for the facility on that principle. The compensation—R3 million—was instantly snapped up in the kray center, and from there went still higher. The rayon, however, was left with its "present." The controversy led quite recently to the setting up of an action group.

Journalist Viktor Prokopenko, former militiaman Yuriy Pirogov, and local doctors began picking their way through the screen of mystery and secrecy. At their insistence the kray party committee sent in an impressive commission comprising geologists and specialists from civil defense, the State Committee for the Protection of the Environment, and the kray health and epidemiology station. They measured radioactivity in several spots and acquainted themselves with the documents. A meeting with the public was then held and an official document read out there. According to this document the burial site will pose no danger to the environment. All the radioactive waste will, after processing, be pumped into the the pipes of the tunnel (under the Yenisey) and thence transported into clay strata situated at a depth of 700 meters. In exchange for living next to the burial ground the villagers were promised new houses, a hospital, and a hog-raising complex. All this munificence, discounting the R20 million already squandered on the tunnel under the Yenisey, comes to tens of millions of rubles spent on piping and concrete. The rustics' heads were supposed to go into a spin at this point over the promised paradise and prosperity. However, the great satirist of the last century was perspicacious when he wrote: "The ordinary folk got quite het up and began to ask questions." Apt questions came thick and fast at the meeting.

"Why has our country been chosen as a dumping ground, and why will a burial ground be built close by a city with a million inhabitants, a city already choking from harmful discharges?"

"Isn't the 15-year-old project now out of date, and how can you talk about high-quality construction work if the construction site is not protected?"

"Why does the tunnel pass under the Yenisey and thereby make one of the world's giant rivers a hostage to fortune?"

"Why is there not a single academic on the commission?"

The questions were abundant. Answers were not found to them all. Representatives of the health and epidemiological station and civil defense repeated a much-loved expression of theirs: "The danger of an accident amounts to ten to the power of minus seven." Milkmaids and stockraisers hurriedly set about calculating the roots of this abstruse formula, but it was immediately explained to them that the danger was equivalent to almost zero. This "almost" disturbed the equilibrium of these arable farmers and stockraisers. Their indignation reached its acme. But an even greater fog of mystery loomed over the vicinity. A. Bolsunovskiy and A. Degermendzhiyev, young environmental scientists, came from Krasnoyarsk of their own volition. They brought with them the text of a petition in the form of a letter to the leader of their institute. It only remained for the chairman of the local rayon soviet executive committee to sign it, but he could not bring himself to do so. And the rayon newspaper was instructed not to publish material on the meeting.

People expected that the Congress of People's Deputies would clear the fog. But the telegrams from the action group and the rural inhabitants were blocked somewhere en route to the rostrum. Although Vasiliy Belov and other deputies made it unambiguously plain in their speeches that a powerful state should not be turned into a radioactive waste dump. It is not known who is now deciding the fate of the burial ground and where this is being done. It is only known that no good can come to the people of Krasnoyarsk if it is put next door to them. The planned transfer of waste from Europe along such a long tunnel and the concentration of waste in the immediate vicinity of a city with a million inhabitants is daily generating greater and greater alarm. Still greater alarm is caused by the suggestion that we will bury our pride here along with the waste from European countries.

Deputies' Request
To the USSR Minister of Nuclear Power Generation
To the USSR Minister of Medium Machine Building

To the USSR Minister Of Health

How advisable and safe is it to build near Krasnoyarsk a facility for the burial of radioactive waste from European countries' nuclear power stations?
[Signed] V.P. Astafyev, R.Kh. Solntsev, USSR people's deputies

Hostage-Taking Growing in Soviet Prisons

PM1906105489 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Kornev report, followed by "Our Commentary" incorporating interview with Lieutenant Colonel of the Internal Service V. Prokopenko: "Taking Hostages: Why have Emergencies Become Commonplace?"]

[Text] Yu. Kitsuk and Ye. Rodionov were being led to their cells after exercise in the Volgograd remand detention center between 1700 and 1800 hours on 13 June. Rodionov suddenly rushed forward and dragged a female member of the prison staff, who was opening the barred door of the cell at that moment, into the corridor. Kitsuk rushed after him. The door slammed shut. Pointed objects—sharpened bars—were thrust against the woman. The security guards who rushed after them were stopped in their tracks by the warning: "Try opening the door and we'll finish off the hostage...."

V. Kucherenko, chief of the corrective affairs administration of the oblast Internal Affairs Administration, tells the story: "One of the criminals' first demands was to bring Yu. Kitsuk's brother Sergey, who was in another cell. The ultimatum was backed up by a threat: 'If you do not do this, we will finish off your colleague.' There was reason to fear this: All three had previous convictions. This time the investigation on a charge against Rodionov of murdering his father-in-law was already finished, and they were preparing to hand him over to the court, while the brothers were under investigation on charges of rape and brutal killing of a minor. We were afraid that the criminals' nerve would crack, and then.... That is why we were forced to give them three pistols." But shortly after, an arrest group was sent out to capture them...

The outcome was that two of the three gangsters died of gunshot wounds on the spot, and the third, who was seriously wounded, died in hospital the following day, despite having an operation.

Our Commentary

Alas, such reports can no longer be called sensational. The fact is that in the last few weeks a series of similar crimes have taken place in prisons, representing an increased danger for the public. Here are the figures: While there were 15 incidents of hostages being taken by prisoners during the whole of 1988, in just over 5 months of this year, there were 35.

"All the same, you should not talk about such things becoming a matter of course"—this assertion began the conversation between IZVESTIYA's correspondent and Lieutenant Colonel of the Internal Service Vladimir Prokopenko, an expert from the press center of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD]. "For the employees of the MVD internal troops and the KGB, the taking of hostages and connected operational activities are always emergencies. So I agree, our readiness to deal with this type of occurrence must be considerably increased. At the moment we are losing our people, and sometimes the victims of gangsters' attacks suffer too. Now let us look at the most important thing. Why has there been an outbreak of brutality and why do criminals now go to extremes?

"In recent years, since the amnesty decree was implemented, the overwhelming majority of convicts who confessed their guilt and behaved appropriately in the colony have been released. As a result, the criminal situation in prisons has become extremely complex. Here are the figures: The proportion of those serving sentences who were convicted of premeditated murder has now reached 11.5 percent, with 10.1 percent convicted of premeditated grievous bodily harm, and 6.5 percent robbery with violence. A study of the conditions in which hostages are taken shows that it is these categories that form the environment from which over 80 percent of criminal groups spring.

"The increased complexity of the criminogenic composition of the prisoners has aggravated the situation in the colonies. To confirm this I will cite these facts: In the first 5 months of this year, the number of crimes committed in corrective labor establishments and remand detention centers has risen by 28.8 percent. This includes increases of 32 percent in premeditated murders, 18 percent in grievous bodily harm, and 64 percent in escapes or attempted escapes."

[Correspondent] But let me repeat my question: This situation did not come about suddenly, we should have been prepared for it....

[V. Prokopenko] You are right, the corrective labor institutions' employees did not always correctly understand how to behave in response to the increased complexity of the criminogenic composition of convicts. And the professional reaction to the changing operational conditions was tardy. The necessary conclusions are, of course, being drawn from what happened. But it is impossible to break the chain of terrorist actions all at once: Practice shows that such outbreaks are very "contagious" in a criminal environment. Although it should be clear to everyone that there is no chance of breaking out of captivity by committing another crime. Another important detail: The activities of terrorists are objectively contrary to the interests of the main bulk of convicts, they intensify public feelings against the

humanization of criminal and corrective labor legislation, and drastically lower the stock of public trust toward people who have committed crimes.

[Correspondent] At the beginning of this account from Volgograd, we reported the casualties among the terrorists. But operations to render them harmless also involve casualties among MVD employees....

[V. Prokopenko] Unfortunately, that is true. In the past 3 years, 8 employees have died and more than 130 were wounded in prisons at the hands of gangsters. In all, over those years more than 300 soldiers and officers were attacked. All this urgently demands a decisive strengthening of legal and technical protection for our employees. The appropriate legislative measures are now being drawn up.

Economic

Free Economic Zones Discussed at News Conference

PM2006120089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 2

[G. Alimov report on Moscow news conference: "Free Economic Zones: The Soviet Model"—date of news conference not stated]

[Text] A news conference on the problems of the creation of free economic zones on Soviet territory was held for Soviet and foreign journalists in Moscow for the first time.

This extensive subject, which began to be discussed actively about 2 years ago, is now becoming more or less concrete, by all appearances. I. Ivanov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Foreign Economic Commission, stated that it is now no longer a question whether or not to create free economic zones. The only problem now, he said, is how to do it. He reported that one of three drafts that have been prepared will probably be put into practice by the end of this year. Among the first contenders are the cities of Vyborg, Nakhodka, and—and this is a sensation—Novgorod.

But in connection with the last city, it is not an exception to the rule. I. Ivanov explained: Free economic zones may be located not only in border regions, but in the innermost regions of the USSR, and may be on a considerable territorial scale. This is a peculiarity of the Soviet model. As you know, in foreign practice free economic zones are small territorial enclaves with particularly favorable status for the activity of foreign capital, having only weak links with the national market and oriented primarily toward the development of exports.

"This model is only partly appropriate to the needs of our economy," I. Ivanov said, "it needs adjusting, and the activity of the 'zones' should be aimed at resolving not so much foreign economic tasks, as the country's general economic tasks."

Many questions relating to the organization of free economic zones remain open. As yet, only a draft concept exists for their formation and operation on the USSR's territory.

All the same, the basic idea of the Soviet model of "zones" appears to have become established. What emerges from the proposed concept is this: Economic formations of this kind should be formed and should operate within the USSR's economy as an integral component of it, and should offer favorable status for the activity of not only foreign firms, but also Soviet enterprises.

Will the "zones" have a special political status? This and other questions are of great interest to all of us. The draft concept gives answers to these questions. The "zones" will have only economic status. Their configuration and borders will be defined on the basis of considerations of economic expediency, while the territory will remain a part of the country's sovereign territory. Union and the relevant republican legislation will apply to them. Amendments to it can only concern social and economic matters. For instance, hiring and dismissal from work. The free economic zone will operate as an autonomous, economically accountable unit.

How will the cadre question be resolved? The draft concept envisages that it will be mainly on the basis of the local population. However, in order to supplement manpower it is permitted to bring people in, on a contract basis, from other parts of the country and from foreign states.

What forms of ownership are planned to use in the "zone"? Economic activity based on all modern forms of ownership is permitted—private foreign types, joint, state, or cooperative types.

How will the "zones" carry out their foreign economic activity? In relations with the foreign market they will operate as a territory open to all types of foreign economic activity, with particularly favorable status for joint enterprise and for foreign investments.

Will the system of state orders extend to enterprises in the "zones"? As a part of the Soviet economy, it is envisaged that the "zone" will be allocated a state order of a given size and range on a centralized basis. The total size of this order will probably not exceed 50 percent of the total production of the goods in question.

What kind of currency system is envisaged? Internal economic circulation in the zone will take place primarily in rubles. Alternatively, the "zone" may have its own currency in parallel with the ruble. This could be common to a number of "zones."

Who will govern the "zone"? The supreme organ of power is the local soviet of people's deputies. Executive functions of management are invested in an administration formed by the soviet and accountable to it. It is envisaged that the administration will be headed by a general administrator of the zone, appointed by the soviet.

...There are still many questions. The immediate future will show how things turn out. Let us see what comes of it. We must wait for the first "swallow." Will it make a summer?

Scientific

'Cosmos-2028' Orbital Parameters Published
PM2006113589

[Report under the rubric "Satellite Launched"]

[Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 17 June publishes in its Second Edition on page 2 a TASS report on the 16 June launching of the "Cosmos-2028" artificial satellite under the headline "Satellite Launched." The PRAVDA version gives the following orbital parameters for the satellite:

"initial duration of revolution—89.5 minutes;
"maximum distance from earth's surface (at apogee)—314 km;
"minimum distance from earth's surface (at perigee)—217 km;
"inclination of orbit—70 degrees."

Military

Commentary on Air Force Captain's Defection
LD1906154489 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Commentary by military affairs observer (Eduard Asaturov)]

[Text] [Announcer] Try to picture an Army serviceman—even more so, a professional officer—defecting to another country, in the latest combat aircraft into the bargain. Before that, he puts a strong poison into the food of the guards at his airfield, shoots all the bullets in his pistol in cold blood into a watchman near the crack aircraft. Having taken off, he tries to make a strike from the air on his own airfield in order to prevent any pursuit. Unfortunately, this is how Soviet Air Force Captain Zuyev acted, having flown in a MiG-29 fighter plane to Turkey recently. Here is our military affairs observer, (Eduard Asaturov):

[(Asaturov), in Russian fading to English translation] When I read the first report about the defection I learned that before that Captain Zuyev had been taken off flights, and so I regarded him as a mental case. I refused to believe that a sane person could do that, but I found out that he was in good mental health. I just cannot believe that, after what he had done, he was released at large in Turkey for the only reason that a Turkish court and, following it, the authorities explained this act by some sort of political motives. More than that, the authorities gave him a chance to go where he wanted—that is, to the United States.

I asked for a comment from a deputy chief military attorney of the USSR, a colonel of justice, Leonid Smertin, who said this:

[Begin Smertin recording, in Russian fading to English translation] According to Soviet laws, the officer has performed grave crimes. I will speak about the two gravest ones. He made an attempt on the life of people, Army servicemen, when he put poison into their food. And he made a deliberate attempt on the life of the watchman at whom he shot. He faces criminal responsibility here, the way he would in any other country since there is nothing more precious than human life. Another gave crime he committed was the seizing and hijacking of an aircraft. Such actions are denounced all over the world and carry severe punishment. Thus Captain Zuyev is a hardcore criminal, whatever his reasons for such conduct, and therefore he must face punishment. [end recording]

[(Asaturov)] That's the view of a prestigious Soviet military lawyer. But nevertheless, it's a fact that this man, who committed several grave crimes, obviously has backing outside the USSR. This must be due to the fact that this former Soviet Air Force pilot, of first class, defected in the latest fighter plane and knows its possibilities and principles of use in combat. It is possible that someone expects to receive the necessary information out of him and so ignores the fact that his crimes demand punishment, which is ultimately part of human morals.

Officers Honored for Service in Afghanistan
PM2006112789

[Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 17 June publishes on page 1 of its First Edition three USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees signed by M.S. Gorbachev, as chairman, and dated Moscow, the Kremlin, 16 June 1989. The decrees award Colonel G.P. Khaustov the title of Hero of the Soviet Union, the Order of Lenin, and the "Gold Star" medal; Colonel A.S. Golovanov, the title of Hero of the Soviet Union (posthumously); and Senior Lieutenant S.V. Peshekhozko the Order of Lenin (posthumously) for their services in Afghanistan and their "courage and heroism."

The decrees are followed by a brief editorial note referring to a 3,400-word article on page 3 by Lieutenant Colonel N. Yesyutin under the rubric "People of Duty and Honor." Headlined "The Aim," this article describes Col Khaustov's exploits in Afghanistan. It contains an excerpt from his personal file that reads as follows:

"During group combat operations he personally destroyed 35 machine gun nests, 41 vehicles and 17 weapons convoys, 46 mortars, 17 anti-aircraft mountain-version rocket launchers, 14 munitions and medicine dumps, 27 rocket projectile launchers....

"His second term of service in Afghanistan coincided with the fulfillment of specifically new tasks by the Limited Contingent of Soviet Troops in Afghanistan. The airmen plowed furrows in the air over the highways along which our columns were traveling home to the motherland. Col Khaustov organized these missions and took to the air at the first opportunity, preventing any attempts by bandit formations to attack the columns. Particular skill were needed here—that is, to "hit home" with zero deflection, as our own vehicles were traveling alongside....

"Khaustov himself was in one of the last groups to come back. He returned with the same unremitting aim—to pass on his combat experience to his younger fellow pilots."